

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXII, 1.

WHOLE No. 85.

---

## I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

The additions to Otto, *Die sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig, 1890, by Victor Szelinski, *Nachträge und ergänzungen zu Otto*, Jena, 1892, and by C. Weyman and A. Sonny in the *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie*, vols. 8 and 9, make a second edition of this valuable work a matter of necessity. To these extensive collections I have added a few more proverbs taken from the whole range of Latin literature, with especial attention to writers of late and mediaeval times.

Particular stress should be laid on the citations from Apuleius as an author who worked in the field of proverbial literature (*Charis.* 1, 240, Keil). We would naturally expect to find proverbs not infrequently used in his other works. Otto cites over one hundred instances from this author; further additions have about doubled the number, making the percentage in his pages a heavy one. A more careful survey of Latin satire has also greatly increased the number of Otto's citations.

Regarding late and mediaeval authors, it has been quite impossible to collect all the material that might come to light by a more extended investigation of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. I have therefore restricted myself, in general, to the epistolary literature in those volumes. Particular authors, among whom I may mention Alcuin, Petrus Damianus, Abelard, Thomas of Canterbury, Gilbert Foliot, John of Salisbury, Nicolaus of Clairvaux, and Stephanus Tornacensis, make frequent use of proverbs the great majority of which are strictly classical. In mediaeval Latin the

usage is literary to a great extent, and, undoubtedly, many of the proverbs cited were no longer current. The value of these citations, however, lies in the fact that we often find expressions that are proverbial in character, but not actually so designated in classical Latin literature, introduced by *ut aiunt*, *ut dicitur*, *ut dici solet*, or *ut vetus proverbium est*. These may now be fairly put on our lists. The importance of such collections as the *monosticha* of Columbanus, the *liber proverbiorum* of Othlo, and the collections which go under the names of Wippo and Baeda, must also not be disregarded, and weight should be given to Alanus Insulensis, who has woven many classical proverbs into his *liber parabolarum* (Migne, 210, 585 ff.). Manitius very justly remarks (Philol. 55, 573) that proverbs cited by mediaeval writers as 'vetera proverbia' may go back to a respectable antiquity, and the vast number of popular proverbs in mediaeval and modern Spanish and Italian may lead us to a similar conclusion.

Following the lead of Otto, I have not infrequently added a phrase that 'klingt sprichwörtlich' to my collection. Further investigation may result in the discovery of parallel passages which will strengthen its position in our lists. Though I might often agree with others and disagree with Otto regarding the strictly proverbial nature of many of his citations, I have felt justified in adding further examples in the hope that such collections may be useful in the annotation of various authors. It is only fair to call attention to the double title of Otto's book and to add that the expression 'proverbial phraseology' may often approach our English term 'slang.'

The longed-for revision of the Greek paroemiographers by Crusius will soon, I trust, make the addition of further parallels from Greek literature unnecessary.

[ABIRE. The well-known words of Cicero, Cat. 2, 1, 1 abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit, appear again as a stock quotation in Hier. ep. 109, 2; compare Otto, *venire*, p. 303.]

ACCEDERE, p. 2. See Heraeus, p. 32.<sup>1</sup>

ACCUSARE, p. 2. Augustin. ep. 148, 4 (M. 33, 624), again brings the two verbs together; hoc non excuso, sed accuso.

ACETUM, p. 2. Compare Theokr. 15, 148 *χὼνῆρ ὄξος ἀπαι.*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. Heraeus, Die sprache des Petronius und die glossen, Leipzig, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> P. Tribukait, De proverbiis vulgaribusque aliis locutionibus apud bucolicos Graecos obviis, Königsberg, 1889, p. 37.

ACHERON, p. 3. Change Plaut. Amphitr. 627 to Mil. glor. 627, and see Lorenz on Pseud. 392. Note also the use of *sepulchrum* Pseud. 412, ex hoc sepulchro vetere; Lucil. sat. 30, 81 (M.) plauta unast, pedibus cariosis, mers Libiteinai.

ACHILLES, p. 3. Propert. 2, 22, 34 hic ego Pelides, hic ferus Hector ego.

ADAMAS, p. 4. Ioh. Sar. ep. 183 (M. 199, 183 B) frons adamante durior; enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 383 B) frons adamante tibi sit durior; Anthol. Pal. 5, 246, 3 ψυχὴ δ' ἐξ ἀδάμαντος ἀπείθεος.<sup>1</sup>

[AEDES 2. Plaut. Most. 80 periere et aedis et ager, sounds proverbial.]

AEGROTUS, p. 5. Terence, Andr. 309 is cited by Hincmar (M. 124, 1062 B), by Thom. Cant. ep. 100 (M. 190, 576 C), and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, prol. (M. 199, 635 C).

AER 3, p. 6. Alcuin, vit. S. Richar. 1, 177 (M. 101, 684) aerem verberans; Petr. Damian. ep. 6, 23, 217 (M. 144, 412) sic curro non quasi in incertum, sic pugno non quasi aerem verberans; Petr. Blesensis, ep. 124 (M. 207, 370 A), and frequently in Steph. Tornacensis. Compare for Greek, Suidas ἀέρα δαίρειν.<sup>2</sup>

AES 2, p. 7. Symmach. ep. 3, 14, 1 in meo aere duco; compare Seneca, ep. 87, 17 virtus . . . suo aere censetur.

AES 4. As a lasting substance; Hor. c. 3, 30, 1 exegi monumentum aere perennius; Ennod., p. 476, 2 (H.) mansuro perenniter aere; p. 465, 25 (H.) perenni aere formatus; compare Ovid, trist. 1, 5, 53 pectus mihi firmitus aere, and Hor. c. 1, 3, 9 aes triplex | circa pectus erat. Note the similar use of *triplex* to denote strength under *duo* 3, p. 122, n., Otto.

AES ALIENUM. Sen. ep. 19, 11 leve aes alienum debitorem facit, grave inimicum; cf. Tac. ann. 4, 18 beneficia eo usque laeta sunt, dum videntur exsolvi posse; ubi multum antevenere, pro gratia odium redditur. The expression of Seneca sounds proverbial.

AETNA 1, p. 7. With Plaut. Mil. 1065 compare Lucil. sat. 3, 7 (M.) αἰγίλοι Montes, Aetnae omnes, asperi Athones.

AFRICA 2, p. 8. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 15, 8 Africa quot seges; Stat. silv. 3, 3, 91 aestiferi quicquid terit area Nili. Compare Juvenal 5, 119 O Libye, disiunge boves, dum tubera mittas.

<sup>1</sup> For Greek parallels see O. Schmidt, Metapher und gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians, Winterthur, 1897, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> See Kurtz, Philol. Suppl.-bd. 6, p. 308.

Claudian. 22, 394 ut mihi vel Massyla Ceres vel Gallica prosit fertilitas; 1, 60; Sicily is referred to in a similar way, Ovid, met. 5, 481 fertilitas terrae latum vulgata per orbem.

AGER 1, p. 8. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 8, 2 agrum si mediocriter colas, possides; si nimium, possideris.

AGERE 2, p. 9. Plaut. Rud. 19 iterum ille eam rem iudicatam iudicat; Cic. ad fam. 14, 1, 5 vide, ne puerum perditum perdamus. Compare the Greek proverb *κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένην* Diogen. 5, 85.

AGERE 2, p. 9, n. Add Ter. Eun. 717, Andr. 465, Adelph. 325, Heaut. 456, 584, Plaut. Trin. 308.

AGERE 3, p. 9. Add Plaut. Casin. 401 hoc age; Cist. 693, Mil. glor. 1114; Pers. 583; Poen. 761, 1407; Pseud. 152; Hor. ep. 1, 6, 31; Sen. ben. 3, 36, 2; Sulla cited clem. 1, 12, 2; ep. 108, 27; epigr. 93, 8 (PLM. 4 Baehr.); Iuven. 7, 20; Suet. Calig. 58. Compare also Plaut. Stich. 710 bibe, si bibis; Poen. 1236 ite, si itis; Casin. 765 quin datis, si quid datis; Poen. 511 si ituri hodie estis, ite; Casin. 831 date ergo, daturae si umquam estis hodie uxorem; Mil. glor. 1186; Capt. 183; Most. 1100 with Lorenz' note; Brix to Capt. 441; Barta, p. 21, n. 4<sup>1</sup>; Crusius, p. 137.<sup>2</sup>

[AGMEN. Sen. d. 5, 2, 3 saepe in iram uno agmine itum est; n. q. 3, 27, 1; Dracont. 5, 245 omnes uno agmine cives; Livy 6, 9, 10; 9, 30, 5; 27, 49, 8. So *agmine facto* Sen. ep. 104, 19; Iuven. 3, 163; 10, 218; Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 59 (M. 201, 90 A) omnes fere quasi agmine facto.]

AIAX. Plaut. Capt. 615 Aiace, hunc quom vides, ipsum vides; compare *Achilles*, p. 3, Otto.

ALCEDONIA, p. 11. Fulgent. 1, p. 4, 13 (Helm) Alcione niduli placidam serenitatem. See Kurtz, p. 308, for the Greek proverb *ἀλκωνίδες ἡμέραι* in Eustathius.

ALCINOUS, p. 12. CIL. 14, 2773 hortulus hic Vari, | est opus Alcinoi. See Bücheler's note, Carm. Epigr. 886. I do not adopt Bücheler's view that Alcinous was the name of the landscape-gardener, as the connection with *hortus* appears obvious.

ALEA. For the metaphorical use of *alea* compare Sen. ben. 3, 11, 1 ut aequiore animo adirent aleam; Cassiod. var. 3, 1, 1 cavete subito in aleam mittere; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 4, 6, 3 intra iactum tantae aleae; Petrus Blesensis, ep. 42 (M. 207, 123 B) in alea tanti discri-

<sup>1</sup> F. Barta, Sprachliche studien zu den satiren des Horaz, Linz, 1881.

<sup>2</sup> O. Crusius, Untersuch. zu Herondas, Leipzig, 1892.

minis diutius ludere. For the Greek form of the proverb see Meleager, Anthol. Pal. 12, 117, 1, and Peter, JJ. 155, 858.

ALGA, p. 13. Aldhelm aenigm. 14 (M. 89, 198) spretis vilior algis.

ALIENUS 1, p. 13. Ter. Phorm. 173 itaque plerique omnes sumus ingenio: nostri nosmet paenitet; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 3, 13, 3 quemque non pascit tam panis bonus quam panis alienus; compare Sen. d. 7, 6, 2 contentus amicusque rebus suis.<sup>1</sup>

ALIENUS 1, n., p. 13. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 57 is cited by Othlo lib. prov. 9 (M. 146, 315 D).

ALIENUS 2, p. 13. Ioh. Sar. metal. prol. (M. 199, 823 A) qui malunt aliena carpere quam sua respicere; compare also ep. 254 (298 A) oculum non quaerat caecum qui curare debuerat lippientem. Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 A) cites Cic. Tusc. 3, 30, 73.

ALIENUS 5, p. 14. Compare Sen. ep. 77, 8 liberalis, etiam cum de suo fieret.

ALIENUS 6, p. 15. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 B) tu econtra velut graculus Aesopius superbia tumidus; see Schmidt, l. c., p. 83.

ALIENUS 8. Plin. ep. 1, 17, 4 scias ipsum plurimis virtutibus abundare, qui alienas sic amat; append. sent. 110 (Ribb.) virtutes habet abunde qui alienas amat.

ALTER 1, p. 15. Gruter inscr. 928, 9 (Carm. Epigr. 192, 3 B.) ab alio speres, altero quod feceris; Orelli inscr. 4876 quod si nocueris, noceberis ab alio; 4802 quod feceris, et tibi alius faciet. See Haupt, Philol. 3, 378, no. 51.

ALTER 2, p. 16. Columban. monost. 86 (M. 80, 289) quod tibi vis fieri, hoc alii praestare memento; 88 quod tibi non optes, alii ne feceris ulli. The form, quod tibi non vis fieri, alteri ne feceris, is cited as a proverb by Othlo lib. prov. 16 (M. 146, 327 B) and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 7 (M. 199, 527 B).

ALTER 5, p. 16. For Greek parallels see H. Koch, II, p. 22.

ALTER 5, n. 2, p. 16. See Sen. apoc. 14; Cic. ad Attic. 7, 18, 4 cites the Greek proverb *μηδὲ δίκην*.

ALTUS, p. 17. Bachar. de repar. laps. 22 (M. 20, 1061 B) quia eius qui de humili labitur, levior est ruina; Paul. Rom. ad Licent. 15 (M. 33, 128) si titubes, summa peius ab arce cades; Maxim. Taur. hom. 101 (M. 57, 489) ut tanto altius caderet, quanto sublimius volitasset; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1107) quanto altior

<sup>1</sup>For Greek parallels see H. Koch, p. 21, Quaestionum de proverbiis apud Aesch. Soph. Eurip. caput alterum, Bartenstein, 1892.

gradus, tanto profundior casus; Alcuin ep. 56, 64 (M. 100, 223) cavere debet ne cadat, quia ruina altioris loci periculosior esse dignoscitur; ep. 72 (245 A) si gaudendum est de ascensu, timendum est de lapsu, quia de altiori loco periculosior est lapsus; moral. 23, 140 (M. 101, 630) tantoque profundius labitur, quanto excelsius elevatur; Fulgent. Rusp. ep. 3, 25 (M. 65, 333) ut graviori lapsu de alto possit deiicere; Rather. Veron. praeloq. 2, 5 (M. 136, 199 C); Hildebert. carm. misc. 1345 (M. 171, 1419 B) et venit a summo summa ruina gradu; Petr. Bles. ep. 90 (M. 207, 284 B) semper in altum nititur, ut gravius cadat; compare Cic. or. 28, 98 medius (orator) . . . magnum tamen periculum non adibit—alte enim cadere non potest; cf. Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 A) qui iacet in terra, non habet unde cadat; Vagell. frag. 1 (Baehr., Frag. Poet. Rom.) si mihi sorte cadendum est, | e caelo cecidisse velim; Sen. d. 11, 15, 1 quem fortuna in hoc evexerat, ne minus alte eum deiceret quam patrem deiecerat.

AMARE 1, p. 17. Propert. 1, 19, 12 traicit et fati litora magnus amor; Cic. or. 10, 33 is cited by Petr. Dam. serm. 29 (M. 144, 665 D) nihil enim amanti difficile esse videtur; Petr. Bles. ep. 86 (M. 207, 272 A), compare Claudian. 22, 412; Verg. ecl. 10, 69 is cited by Alcuin ep. 100 (M. 100, 313 A) omnia vincit amor; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 308 (M. 199, 971 D) si divinus omnia vincit amor; Petr. Chrys. serm. 40 (M. 52, 313 A) si amor est, vincit omnia; Nicol. Clar. ep. 3 (M. 196, 1596 D) nihil esse debuit amori invium; compare Gualbert. act. 374 (M. 146, 954) virtus omnia vincere; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 7, 75 animus tamen omnia vincit. See *labor* 2.

AMARE 2, p. 17. Mart. Dum. form. hon. vit. 5, 2 (Seneca, vol. III, p. 473 H.) ama deum, ut ameris a deo; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Gallicanus, act 1, sc. 7 (M. 137, 982 B) nam vulgo dicitur: qui dilectis obsequitur, et ipse sit dilectus; Sen. ep. 9, 6 is also quoted by Richard. Vict. ep. 7 (M. 196, 1228 B): cerno . . . quam amatorum illud Catonis tenaci memoriae prudentia vestra commendavit: si etc.; Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 384 A) regula fida nimis: quisquis amandus, amet. The word *regula* in mediaeval Latin not infrequently introduces a classic proverb.

AMARE 3, p. 17. Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 582 A) post inimicitias clarior est et amor.

AMARE 4, p. 17. See Greg. Cypr. Leid. 1, 1 Ἀφροδίσιος ὄρκος: οὐκ ἐμποίνιμος, and Leutsch's note; compare also Ovid, am. 1, 8, 86 commodat in lusus numina surda Venus.

AMARE 6, p. 18. Hildebert. de excid. Troiae (M. 171, 1449 D) hic amor est amens; Nicol. Clar. ep. 40 (M. 196, 1639 B) tam

amans quam amens; Ioh. Sar. ep. 206 (M. 199, 229 D) amentis est, non amantis; note also Serv. on Verg. ecl. 8, 66 amantes insanos vocamus; Ter. Andr. 218 is cited by Diomedes ars. gram. II (p. 446, 13 K.) under the term *paronomasia*.

AMARE 8. Sen. ep. 3, 2 isti praepostero officia permiscunt, qui contra praecepta Theophrasti, cum amaverunt, iudicant, et non amant, cum iudicaverunt; Caecil. Balb. sent. 5 ames probatos, non amatos post probes; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 11 (F.) ames iudicio, non amore iudices; for the reference to Theophrastus as the author of this sentiment see Stob. flor. II Δ, 14 (= Plutarch. de frat. am. 8)<sup>1</sup>; compare Petr. Cellensis ep. 95 (M. 207, 302 B) apud antiquos, teste Cicerone, proverbialiter dicitur; exiit personam iudicis quisquis amicum induit; Cic. de off. 3, 43 ponit enim personam amici, cum induit iudicis; Gillebert. ep. 1 (M. 184, 289 B) tam vero quam veteri uteris . . . proverbio, omnia cum amico deliberanda esse, de ipso tamen prius; cf. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 5, 11, 1 est enim consuetudinis meae, ut eligam ante, post diligam.

AMICITIA 2, p. 19. This proverb is frequently met with in mediaeval Latin. Columban. ep. 4 (M. 80, 270) alioqui si non unum velle et unum nolle habetis, melius est ut non simul habitetis; Orest. trag. 293 velle fuit commune viris et nolle duobus; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1096 B) and Othlo lib. prov. 5 (M. 146, 309 D) cite Sall. Cat. 20, 4; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Abraham (M. 137, 1013 C) si unum cor unaque anima iubetur esse, idem velle, idem cogimur nolle; Gualbert. act. 72 (M. 146, 842 B) Mariam itaque virginem sanctosque Christi Iesu omnes eadem velle, eadem nolle; Fulbert. Carnot. ep. 106 (M. 141, 252) quae te cum Domino, quantum homini datur, idem velle atque nolle confido; Petr. Venerab. ep. 2, 22 (M. 189, 236 D) verae amicitiae diffinitionem . . . idem scilicet velle et idem nolle; Nic. Clar. ep. 6 (M. 196, 1600 C) idem velle atque idem nolle; Ioh. Sar. ep. 78 (M. 199, 64 C) vel urgente familiaritatis amicae stimulo idem velle et idem nolle necesse sit vobis; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 241, 355 (M. 211, 511) oblitus fueras regulae qua dicitur, amicorum idem est velle et nolle; CIL. 3, 754 (Carm. Epigr. 492, 14 B.) vellet quod vellem, nollet quoque ac si ego nollem. The expression becomes quite formulaic in mediaeval Latin.

AMICITIA 4, p. 19. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 380 (F.) ut fidus, cum amico multos simul edas modios salis.

<sup>1</sup> Haupt, Herm. 5, 322.

AMICUS 1, p. 20. Sen. ben. 7, 12, 5 quicquid habet amicus, commune est nobis; ep. 48, 3 omnia enim communia cum amico habebit, qui multa cum homine; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 203 multa cui hominis, illi amici cuncta sunt communia; see for Greek examples Diogen. 2, 94 and Koch, II, p. 11.

AMICUS 2, p. 20. Anthol. Pal. 10, 39, 1 *θησαυρὸς μέγας ἔστ' ἀγαθὸς φίλος*.

AMICUS 6, p. 21. Append. sent. 241 (R.) probare amicos in re adversa facilius; Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 301 D) amicus in necessitate probatur; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1091); Odo ad Rich. Pict. ap. Foliot. ep. 422 (M. 190, 1005 B) illud proverbium in te verum experiemur; in necessitate probatur amicus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 267 (M. 199, 308 B) est enim proverbium sapientiae; amicus non cognoscetur in bonis, et in malis non abscondetur inimicus; ep. 272 (311, D) amicitiae titulus radiat clarius in adversis; Apost. 12, 81 b *ὄνομα γὰρ, ἔργον δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν οἱ φίλοι, οἱ μὴ 'πὶ ταῖς <ε> συμφοραῖς ὄντες φίλοι*; Planud. 34 *φίλε μου ἐν τῇ ἀνάγκῃ μου καὶ μὴ ἐν τῇ σπατάλῃ μου*.<sup>1</sup>

AMICUS 7, p. 22. Plaut. Pers. 655 nam etsi res sunt fractae, amici sunt tamen; Hor. c. 1, 35, 26 diffugiunt cadis | cum faece siccatis amici; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 3, 10 et cum Fortuna statque caditque fides; ex Pont. 3, 2, 8; 4, 3, 7; Sen. ep. 9, 9 circa eversos solitudo est, et inde amici fugiunt, ubi probantur; Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 5 sed quem felicitas amicum fecit, infortunium faciet inimicum; append. sent. 182 (R.) res parant secundae amicos optime, adversae probant; Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 303 B); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1091); Alcuin ep. 58, 67 (M. 100, 226 C) multi sunt in prosperitate amici, in adversitate rari; Henric. Rem. ep. 5 (M. 196, 1567 C) vera est nimis illa sententia, quia vos divites coluerunt, pauperes respicere dedignantur; Ioh. Sar. ep. 186 (M. 199, 196 D) amici obsurdescunt qui . . . fidem umbratilem . . . ponunt et deponunt ad arbitrium Fortunae; CIL. 12, 955 (Carm. Epigr. 470, 1 B.) quat valeas, abeas, pascas, multos tu habebes amicos; Marc. Argent. Anthol. Pal. 5, 113, 6 *ἡ μόλις ἔγνωσ | τοῦτ' ἔπος, ὥς οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἔχοντι φίλος*; 10, 35, 3 *ἦν πταίσσης, οὐδεὶς ἔτι σοι φίλος*.<sup>2</sup>

AMICUS 11, p. 23. Plaut. Bacch. 386 homini amico quist amicus; notiz. d. scavi 1893, p. 422 (Carm. Epigr. 689, 2 B.) cum amicis amicus; CIL. 6, 6275 amicus amico; Bormann inscrip. lat. nov., p. 11 (Carm. Epigr. 1000, 1 B.) amicus amicis.

<sup>1</sup> Crusius, Rhein. Mus. 42, 402.

<sup>2</sup> H. Koch, II, p. 11.

AMICUS 12, p. 23. Columban. monost. 41 (M. 80, 288) ignotum noto numquam praeponas amico; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 41 (M. 89, 740) memorem te esse . . . desidero sapientis cuiusdam sententiae qui dixit; serva antiquum amicum; compare Fronto, p. 162, 10 (Nab.) nam vulgo dicitur quod potius sit, antiquius esse.

AMICUS 13. Sen. ep. 19, 11 errat autem, qui amicum in atrio quaerit, in convivio probat, sounds proverbial.

AMICUS 14. Hier. ep. 3, 6 (M. 22, 335) obsecro te ne amicum qui diu quaeritur, vix invenitur, difficile servatur . . . amittat; Bonifat. Mogunt. ep. 30 (M. 89, 729) amicus diu quaeritur, vix invenitur, difficile servatur; Alcuin ep. 84 (M. 100, 275 C) veterum igitur proverbialis fulget sententia, amicus diu etc.; ep. 89 (287 A) iuxta antiquitatis proverbium etc. The proverb may go back to a much earlier period than these citations indicate.

AMOR 1, p. 23. Plaut. Mil. 1258 caeca amore; Propert. 3, 14, 32 caecum versat amator iter; cf. Theokr. 6, 18 ἡ γὰρ ἔρωτι | πολλάκις . . . τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πέφανται.<sup>1</sup> With the last part of Otto's note compare Sen. d. 7, 10, 2 amorem rerum suarum caecum; 7, 14, 2 amore caeco rei; see *fortuna* 1, Otto.<sup>2</sup>

AMOR 3, p. 23. Ovid rem. am. 44 una manus vobis vulnus opemque feret; trist. 1, 1, 99 vel qui mihi vulnera fecit | solus Achilleo tollere more potest; trist. 2, 20; her. 20 (21), 184 pro-sint, quae nocuere, manus; compare Propert. 2, 1, 63; Apul. met. 2, 7. The Greek proverb ὁ τρώσας καὶ ἰδοῦναι is cited by Suet. Claud. 43; see also Kurtz, p. 316,<sup>3</sup> for examples from Eustathius.

AMOR 4. Petron. 108, v. 5 sed contemptus amor vires habet; compare Iuven. 10, 328 mulier saevissima tunc est, | cum stimulos odio pudor admovet.

AMOR 5. Venant. Fortun. c. 5, 6, 12 amor blandus tyrannus est, sounds proverbial.

AMOR 6. Richar. Vict. (M. 196, 10 A) ubi amor, ibi oculus; Ioh. Sar. ep. 167 (M. 199, 158 A) nam ubi amor, ibi oculus; ep. 202 (225 D); Polycrat. 3, 12 (501 B) certe vetus proverbium est quia ubi amor, ibi oculus. The proverb may go back to a respectable antiquity; compare Otto, *oculus* 8.

AMPULLA. Hor. a. p. 97 proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 16 (M. 199, 611 D); Fulco ad

<sup>1</sup> Tribukait, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ambitio*, like *amor* and *Fortuna*, is also spoken of as blind. Sen. ben. 7, 26, 4; Gualbert. (M. 146, 893 B); Ioh. Sar. ep. 147 (M. 199, 140 A).

<sup>3</sup> Philol., suppl.-bd. 6.

Abaelard. ep. 16 (M. 178, 376 A) verba ampullosa; cf. Diogen. 3, 41 ἀμαξία ῥήματα.

AMUSSIS, p. 24. Apul. met. 2, 30 examussim; 10, 2; 11, 27; Placid. gloss., p. 42 (D) emussitatos, ad amussim exactos; p. 37 (D) examussim, integre, sine fraude; Aldhelm ep. 4 (M. 89, 96 B) ut scias tanta rerum arcana examussim non posse intellegi.

AMUSSIS, p. 24, n. Ennod., p. 359, 10 (H.) cuius integritatem velut fabrilibus lineis ad perpendiculum mentis emensus est.

ANGUILLA, p. 25. Hier. adv. Helvid. 14 (M. 23, 207 C) sed ne in aliquo cavilleris et te quasi lubricus anguis evolvas; Lucian anach. 1; see Schmidt, l. c., p. 116, for Greek parallels.

ANGUIS 2, Szelinski, p. 8. Ovid fast. 2, 342 attonitusque metu rediit, ut saepe viator | turbatum viso rettulit angue pedem.

ANGUIS 3. Otto in his note to *anguis*, p. 25, says that Verg. ecl. 3, 93 latet anguis in herba, is not a proverb. But our modern proverb was in use in mediaeval times, for a friend writes to Thomas of Canterbury ep. 368 (M. 190, 700 B) nos autem verebatur ut aliquid magis sublateret: latet enim anguis in herba; Petr. Cell. ep. 154 (M. 202, 597 D) qui latet ut anguis in herba; compare Otto, *vipera* 3.

ANIMUS 1, p. 25. Ovid ex P. 3, 4, 69 magnaue pars animae mecum vixistis, amici; trist. 4, 10, 32 cum perit, et coepi parte carere mei; her. 17 (18), 126; met. 8, 406 pars animae consistit meae; met. 3, 473 nunc duo concordēs anima moriemur in una; Stat. silv. 5, 1, 177 pars animae victura meae; Cypr. ep. 60, 1 dum apud vos unus animus et una vox est; Hier. ep. 105, 2 sic cum amico quasi cum altero se est loquendum; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 589 C) non alter, at idem fiat ego; Rossi inscr. chr. Rom. 2, 79, 6 (Carm. Epigr. 1432, 4 B.) nec solum caro sed spiritus unus erat; CIL. 5, 6729 (Carm. Epigr. 706, 5 B.) una domus, mens una fuit; CIL. 6, 30140 (1296, 4 B) par nobis ae]tas unaque m[ens inerat; Columban. ep. 4 (M. 80, 270 C) sed videte ut unum cor et anima una sitis; Ambros. ep. 6, 1 quasi animae portionem convenio meae; Braulio ep. 23 (M. 80, 672 D) imo sit in Christo una anima tua et mea; ep. 25 (M. 80, 674 B) partem animae meae te esse non dubito; Hrosuitha Mon. Abr. (M. 137, 1013 C) unum cor unaque anima; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1329 (M. 171, 1402 D) mens sumus una duo; Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1632 D) cor unum et animam unam; Gualbert. act. 120 (M. 146, 807 A) unum cor et animam habentes; Ioh. Sar. ep. 81 (M. 199, 68 B) cor unum et anima una; ep. 184 (M. 199, 189 A). Horace's phrase,

*animae dimidium meae*, was freely used by mediaeval writers, so that Thom. Cant. even employs it as a salutation in two of his letters, ep. 100 and 101 (M. 190, 577 B); for other examples see Petr. Ven. ep. 5 (M. 189, 73 A); Thom. Cant. ep. 144 (M. 190, 621 B); Foliot. ep. 130 (M. 190, 839 B); Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1628 B); Gaufrid. ep. 15 (M. 205, 841 D); see also Eustath. on Hom. Il. 1359, 61,<sup>1</sup> ἄλλος αὐτός.

ANIMUS 5 (Sonny, ALL. 8, 485). Compare Apost. 12, 13 νοῦς ὁρᾷ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει with Leutsch's note; Kaibel, Com. Dorica, p. 137.

ANNUS, p. 27. Ovid her. 17 (18), 25 spatium mihi longius anno; Gualbert. act. 217 (M. 146, 895) non dies, ut aiunt, sed annus me deficeret; Nicol. Clar. ep. 45 (M. 196, 1646 A) tantoque affectus sum desiderio ut diem pro anno computaverim mihi. Note the similar use of *aetas*, Ter. Eun. 734 iam dudum, aetatem; Plaut. Truc. 22 non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est | amanti; Asin. 274 and 284; Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 38 (p. 79, 4 Reiff.) quibus enumerandis omnis aetas angusta est.

[ANTEFERRE. Verg. Aen. 4, 371 became a stock quotation; Ennod., p. 292, 16 (H.) sed nunc, ut quidam fertur dixisse, quae quibus anteferam; compare Iuven. 9, 81.]

ANTIQUUS. Fronto, p. 162, 10 (Nab.) nam volgo dicitur quod potius sit, antiquius esse.

ANULUS, p. 27. Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264) consumitur anulus usu; Ovid ex Pont. 4, 10, 6 atteritur pressa vomer aduncus humo; a. a. 1, 474 interit adsidua vomer aduncus humo.

ANUS 1, p. 28. Sen. ep. 94, 2 anilia habentem praecepta (Hense); Prudent. perist. 10, 250 ineptias | quas vinolentae sompniis fingunt anus; 6, 40 dampnes, si sapias, anile dogma; Min. Fel. Oct. 13, 5 anilis . . . superstitio; Lactant. instit. 5, 13, 3 muliebrem aut anilem superstitionem; 5, 1, 14 anilia, inepta, vulgaria; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 32, 227 (M. 144, 422) nescio quos vestrum aniles nugas et otiosa deliramenta perpendit profundere.

ANUS 2, p. 28. Apul. met. 4, 27 lepidis anilibusque fabulis; Fulgent. m. prooem. 1, 3 tibi rugosam sulcis anilibus ordior fabulam; Prudent. perist. 9, 18 non est inanis aut anilis fabula; Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 13, 162 (M. 144, 359) anilis ineptiae naenias conspuatis.

APIS, p. 30. Sen. ep. 84, 3 is cited by Macrobr. sat. 1, praef. 5, and later by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 10 (M. 199, 660 A) and by Petr. Bles. ep. 92 (M. 207, 289 C); compare Auson. Bissul. 6, 2 aemula Cecropias ars imitetur apes.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 308.

APOLLO, p. 30. Placid. gloss., p. 19 (D.) Cirrhearum, quod aiunt inspirationum.

APOLLODORUS. See *Phalaris*.

AQUA 5, p. 31. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 7 (M. 199, 650 A) ac si . . . quis . . . scribat in fluminis lapsu; Meleagr. Anthol. Pal. 5, 8, 5 νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ὄρκια φησὶν ἐν ὕδατι κείνα φέρεσθαι; Eustath. on Odys. 349, 23.<sup>1</sup>

AQUA 12, p. 32. Pers. 2, 19 an scilicet haeres? Iuven. 6, 281 haeremus; cf. Apul. met. 10, 3 ut in quodam vado dubitationis haerens.

AQUILA 2, p. 32. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 114.

AQUILA 4, p. 33. Compare Hor. c. 4, 4, 29 fortes creantur fortibus et bonis.

AQUILA 5. Aldhelm. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 198) plus pernix aquilis.

ARA, p. 33. Fronto, p. 133, 6 (Nab.) foculos, aras; Flor. 2, 1, 2 aris ac focis.<sup>2</sup>

ARABS, p. 33. Tibull. 4, 2, 18 dives Arabs; Lact. de ave phoen. 80 opulentus Arabs.

ARBOR 1, p. 35. Caecil. Stat. 210 (R.) serit arbores, quae saeclo prosint alteri; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 53.

ARCADICUS, p. 35. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C) et asino Arcadiae te dicet tardiozem; metal. 1, 3 (829 B) asello Arcadiae tardior.

ARCUS 1, p. 36. Othlo lib. prov. 1 (M. 146, 303 B) arcum nimia frangit intensio; Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264) absque modo tractus saepissime frangitur arcus.

ARGUS, p. 37. Ovid ars am. 3, 618 quot fuerant Argo lumina, verba dabis; Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 B) videbis illic et oculos Argi (= Apoll. Sidon. ep. 5, 7, 5); see Schmidt, p. 52, for Greek parallels.

[ARMA 2. Ovid her. 6, 140 quamlibet infirmis iste dat arma dolor; Verg. Aen. 1, 150 furor arma ministrat.]

ARS 1, p. 37. Compare Macar. 8, 39 τὸν φρουρὸν χρὴ φρουρεῖν, τὸν ἐρῶντα δ' ἐρᾶν; for Greek parallels see Tribukait, l. c., p. 18.

ARS 3, p. 38. Cic. Tusc. 1, 2, 4 honos alit artes, is cited also by Servat. Lup. ep. 1, 2 (M. 119, 433) and by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8,

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 313. See further, Koch, J., p. 29, De proverbiis apud Aesch. Soph. Eurip., Königsberg, 1887.

<sup>2</sup> Preuss, p. 77, De bimestris dissoluti apud scriptores Romanos usu sollemni, Edenkoben, 1881.

5 (M. 199, 722 A); cf. Cassiod. var. 7, 5, 6 manus larga artium nutrit ingenia.

ARS 4, p. 38. Ovid trist. 2, 450 seque sua miserum nunc ait arte premi; Ovid her. 12, 18 ut caderet cultu cultor ab ipse suo; ex Pont. 2, 9, 44 quive repertorem torruit arte sua; compare her. 11, 72 et indicio proditur ille suo; Hier. ep. 133, 11 qui si iratus fuerit atque rescripserit, suo quasi mus prodetur indicio; Ovid her. 12, 38; Ambros. ep. 2, 13 maledicus autem suis artibus praecipitatur.

ARS 6. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 10, 1 Symmachianum illud te cogitare par fuerat: ut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat; Caes. Arelat. hom. 25 illam sententiam saecularem . . . ut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat; Pelag. pap. ep. 8; Henr. Rem. ep. 20 (M. 196, 1577 A) illud philosophicum quia, sicut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat.

ARTICULUS 2, Szel., p. 19. Cic. Quinct. 19 in ipso articulo temporis; Ammian. Marcell. 16, 12, 37 in ipso proeliorum articulo; Symmach. ep. 2, 76, 2 sub ipso articulo muneris indigemus; Eugipp. vit. S. Sev. 1, 5 in ipso discriminis articulo; Innocent. pap. ep. 43 (M. 20, 612) ipso temporis articulo; Petr. Dam. ep. 4, 8, 111 (M. 144, 310) ipso temporis articulo. Hier. ep. 11, 25 (M. 22, 345) says, in hoc necessitatis articulo, an expression that is very common in the Patrologia, especially in Ioh. Sar. and Steph. Torn.

AS 1, p. 39. Sen. ep. 95, 59 sestertio nummo aestimanda sint.

AS 2, p. 39. Sidon. Apoll. c. 14, pref. 2 non ad assem . . . hinc posse disserere; ep. 1, 11, 7 ex asse persolvo; ep. 3, 14, 2; 4, 18, 1; 6, 11, 1; 6, 12, 8; 7, 2, 9; 8, 6, 9; 9, 2, 1; 9, 3, 7; 9, 14, 2; Avit. Vienn. ep. 83, p. 241, 10 (Chev.) vobis porro si cordi est, facta de nobis ex asse iactura; Servat. Lup. ep. 3, 6 (M. 119, 438 A) expectationem nostram ex asse frustrata est.

ASINUS 1, p. 40. Boeth. consol. phil. 4, 3, 61 (Peip.) stupidus torpit? asinum vivit. Diogen. 6, 73 *Μίδας ὄνον ᾤσα*, the Greek proverb removed from Persius' satire by Cornutus; see schol. to sat. 1, 121; Hier. ep. 125, 18.

ASINUS 5, p. 41. Petr. Cell. ep. 165 (M. 202, 608 C) mihi merito illud proverbium ascribatur, quo dicitur, onos lyras, id est, asinus ad lyram; Varro Sat. Menipp., p. 179, 6 (Riese) *ὄνος λύρας*; testam. 4, p. 229, 2 (R.); Hier. ep. 61, 4 verum est illud apud Graecos proverbium, *ὄνος λύρα*.

ASINUS 7, p. 41. See Crusius, Herondas, p. 65.

ASINUS 9, p. 42. Mart. 1, 79, 3 si res et causae desunt, agis, Attale, mulas. These words of Martial should be taken in connection with Cic. de orat. 2, 64, 258, where Scipio tells Asellus, after his boast, 'agas asellum.' Otto seems to be at a loss for an explanation that will give complete satisfaction. By comparing the two passages, we note that the proverb is applied in each instance to men who have done a little of everything. But one task reminds—a difficult one for anybody—to drive asses; compare Hor. sat. 1, 1, 90 infelix operam perdes, ut si quis asellum | in campo doceat parentem currere frenis; Ovid am. 2, 7, 15 ut auritus miserandae sortis asellus | adsiduo domitus verbere lentus eat. Asellus has travelled with 'adorea plena' through all provinces—his last and greatest task is to learn to control an ass—himself. Attalus is so very clever that he can even drive asses—the only thing left for him to do is 'animam agere.' See also the remarks of Crusius, Herondas, p. 60.

[ASPIS. Commod. instruc. 2, 9, 19 facti vel ut aspides surdi, 'deaf as an adder'; Ennod., p. 72, 25 (Vog.) credo more aspidis clausa, ut aiunt, aure transivit; Hier. ep. 139, 1.]

ATTICUS 1, p. 44. Symmach. ep. 1, 23, 1 Atticis salibus; Fulgent. M. 1, 3, p. 3, 17 (Helm) Attica saporante salsura; Verg. catal. 9 (11), 62 Graios sales; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) vel ut Atticis salibus sint aspersae. To Otto's note add Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 6 elegantiam Graecam; Hier. adv. Rufin. 2, 11 mira eloquentia et Attico flore variata.

ATTICUS 3. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 6, 9 Athenis loquacior; see Woelfflin, ALL. 7, 144.

ATTONDERE, p. 45. For Greek examples see Schmidt, p. 109; compare also Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 9 (M. 199, 562 B) sed nec istud ad unguem resecandum est; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 9, 5 (v. 26) crinibus ad cutem recisis.

AUDIRE, p. 45. Petr. Blesen. ep. 92 (M. 207, 289 D) nam si pergit dicere quae vult, audiet quae non vult (cf. Ter. Andr. 920).

AURA 2. Ovid rem. am. 808 lenis alit flammam, grandior aura necat, cited by Phil. ad. Thom. Cant., Foliot ep. 480 (M. 190, 1045 D), sounds proverbial.

AUREUS, p. 46. Commod. instruc. 1, 34, 18 aurea post fata veniet tibi saecula; Ennod. ep. 9, 27, p. 249, 5 (H.) rem aurei saeculi . . . nescirem; p. 286, 13 aurei bona saeculi . . . amplificet; Symmach. orat. in Grat. 3, 9 iamdudum aureum saeculum currunt fusa Parcarum; CIL. 3, 735 (Carm. Epigr. 285, 2 B.) aurea saecula

gerit, qui portam construit auro; Claudian. 3, 51 *en aurea nascitur aetas*; incert. in Caes. Rom. 6, 2 (Frag. Poet. Rom., Baehr., p. 379) *aurea saecula volens*; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 762 (M. 199, 981 D) *et redeunt aurea secla patrum*; Adam. Pers. ep. 8 (M. 211, 605) *ubi enim coelestis sapientiae splendor rutilat . . . aurea sunt ibi saecula*; for Greek parallels see Tribukait, p. 44.

AURIS 1, p. 47. Nicol. Clar. ep. 15 (M. 196, 1610 A) *si in utramque aurem valeas obdormire*.

AURIS 2, p. 47. Hor. epod. 17, 53 *quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?* Ovid ex Pont. 2, 9, 25 *Iuppiter oranti surdas si praebeat auris*; Orest. trag. 778 *surdis tamen auribus inquit*; Paulin. Nol. c. 10, 114 *surda vocas et nulla rogas*; Gaudent. Brix. serm. 13, 317 (M. 20, 938) *surdis auribus precantem pauperem praeterit*; Aesch. sept. 202 *ἤκουσας ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας ἢ κωφῇ λέγω*; Greg. Cypr. 3, 32 *παρὰ κωφῇ διαλέγη*; see Leutsch's note and J. Koch, p. 28, for further Greek parallels; compare also Sen. ep. 29, 1 *si quis surdos obiurget*.

AURIS 4, p. 48. Paulin. Nol. ep. 49, 3 *vellicata blande auricula*; ep. 49, 7 *aurem vellit*; ep. 49, 14.

AURIS 5, p. 49. Plaut. Rud. 1293 *suo mihi hic sermone arrexit auris*; Sen. ep. 108, 39 *auribus erectis curiosisque audienda*; d. 7, 23, 5; ep. 68, 9; Sidon. Apoll. c. 16, 4 *auritos erexit carmine muros*; Cypr. ep. ad Fortun. 4 (M. 4, 680 A) *inde aures erigantur*; Diogen. Vindob. 3, 97 *ὥσιν ἐστῶσιν*, and Leutsch's note.

AURIS 7, Sonny, ALL. 8, 485. Calp. ecl. 4, 148 *obesis auribus apta*.

[AURIS 9. Plaut. Mil. 774 *perpurigatis damus tibi ambo operam auribus*; Pers. 5, 63 *iuvenum purgatas inseris aures*; Hor. ep. 1, 1, 7 *est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet aurem*; compare Pers. 1, 126 *vaporata aure*, and see Leutsch to Macar. 5, 37.]

AURUM 1, p. 49. Ovid a. a. 2, 299 *pretiosior auro*; am. 3, 8, 3; Sen. ep. 73, 5 *auro pensanda*; Claudian. 26, 607; Maxim. eleg. 1, 19 *virtus fulvo pretiosior auro*; schol. Pers. 1, 53 *citrum pretiosum notabatur et auro comparandum*. The simile is very frequently employed in mediaeval Latin; Maxim. Taur. hom. 82 (M. 57, 432) *quae bona omnia auro magis sunt pretiosa*; Columban. mon. 189 (M. 80, 291) *amor est pretiosior auro*; Alcuin ep. 175 (M. 100, 445); poet. Carol. 1, p. 281, N. 62, 187, and 1, p. 304, N. 86, 11; Petr. Dam. serm. 12, 58 (M. 144, 566); Othlo dial. 50 (M. 146, 131 B); lib. prov. 5 (309 D); Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 3 (M. 189, 190 A); 3, 17 (321 D); 4, 35 (365 D); Foliot ep. 197 (M. 190, 906 D);

ep. 212 (968 A); Petr. Cell. ep. 159 (M. 202, 604 B); Philip. Harv. ep. 14 (M. 203, 121 D). Plin. ep. 10, 39 (48), 6 substitutes *pecunia*, omni pecunia pretiosius; similarly *thesauro*, Apul. d. Plat. 2, 21; Cassiod. var. 5, 4, 2; Petr. Ven. ep. 4, 39 (M. 189, 373 A); with *gaza*, poet. Carol. 2, p. 359, D. 10, 3;<sup>1</sup> for Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 30, and cf. *gemma*.

AURUM 5, p. 49. Valerian. hom. 6 (M. 52, 117 D) auri fames; Alcuin ep. 121 (M. 100, 356 A) sed quid non efficit auri sacra fames; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 15 (M. 199, 774 C) auri sacra fames; for Gregor. Turon. see Bonnet, p. 50, n. 3<sup>2</sup>; compare Maxim. eleg. 3, 73 auri caecus amor; Columban. c. 3, 32 (M. 80, 292) auri dira cupido; Alcuin ep. 35 (M. 100, 192 B) quid enim auri insana cupido non subvertit boni? cf. Prudent. ham. 149 improba mors, quid non mortalia pectora cogis?

AURUM 6, p. 50. Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 21, 46 (M. 144, 249) habens enim, ut aiunt rustici, pugillum aureum frangis murum ferreum; compare Ovid am. 3, 8, 29 nihil esse potentius auro; for a similar idea in Greek, Diogen. 4, 21 δῶρα θεοῦς πείθει; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 2, 83, with Leutsch's note; Macar. 3, 43; Eustath. Il. 708, 61.<sup>3</sup>

AURUM 7. Venant. Fort. c. 4, 4, 14 pulchrius est auro corde probatus homo; Orest. trag. 330 pulchrum sane aurum, sed femina pulchrior auro. See *aurum* 1.

AVARUS 3, p. 51. Boeth. consol. phil. 3, 3 taceo quod naturae minimum, quod avaritiae nihil satis est; compare Varro, Eumen. 20 (Riese); Ps.-Baeda prov. lib. (M. 90, 1110) semper avarus eget, hunc nulla pecunia replet.

AVIS 1, p. 51. Plin. n. h. 9, 20 ocior volucre; Angilbert. de Car. Magn., v. 295 (Poet. Carol. 1, p. 373 D.) ocior aligeris avibus; Auson. ep. 35 (21), 22; Sil. Ital. 15, 413; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.

AVIS 2, p. 51. Columban. ep. 5 (M. 80, 274 C) rara avis; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 8, 11 (M. 199, 751 B) suavis uxor, quae tamen rara avis est (citing Hieronymus); Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 C) quandoquidem haec rara avis est; 8, 11 (753 B), quoting Iuven. 6, 165; Petr. Bles. ep. 175 (M. 207, 470 A); Hildebert. carm. misc. 1322 (M. 171, 1394 C) mulier corvo sit rarior albo.

BALAENA. Aldhelm de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 199) grandior quam ballena. Such a simile may have existed easily in earlier

<sup>1</sup> Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 459.

<sup>2</sup> Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, Paris, 1890.

<sup>3</sup> Kurtz, p. 311.

times; compare Iuv. 10, 14 quanto delphinis ballaena Britannica maior.

BELLEROPHON 2, as a type of horseman. Hor. c. 3, 12, 8 eques ipso melior Bellerophonte; Apul. met. 7, 26 meum vero Bellerophontem.<sup>1</sup>

BELLUM 1, p. 54. Caecil. Balb. 141 o beatam civitatem, pace quae bellum timet; compare Cassiod. var. 1, 40 discat miles in otio quod perficere possit in bello; Sen. ep. 18, 6 quem in ipsa re trepidare nolueris, ante rem exerceas.

BENEFICIUM 1, p. 55. Caecil. Balb. sent. 48 dat gratius beneficium, qui dat celerius; Augustin. ep. 150, 1 (M. 33, 645) tanto gratius, quanto citius; compare Ioh. Sar. ep. 260 (M. 199, 301 D) ut philosophus testis est, bis emitur, cum rogatur; sent. Varr. 15 (Riese) extorquere est plus quam semel rogare; compare Sen. ben. 3, 8, 4 ut plus praestaturus fuerit, si cito negasset.

BENEFICIUM 3. Nicol. Clar. ep. 11 (M. 196, 1608) vetus proverbium est et veterum ore celebrata sententia: beneficiorum memoria labilis est, iniuriarum vero tenax.

BESTIA 1, p. 55. Ps.-Lactant. de mort. persec. 2, 7 mala bestia; 25, 1; for *belua* as a term of reproach see Plaut. Most. 607, Liv. 7, 10, 3; Sen. d. 5, 19, 3; cf. Oros. 7, 4, 7.

BESTIA 4. Claudian. 11, 26 quis beluarum corde furentior? 18, 183; Arnob. adv. nat. 7, 9, p. 244, 2 (Reiff.) ferocitate transiliunt beluas; Paulin. Aquil. ep. ad Heist. (M. 99, 183 A) crudelior omni bestia; Alcuin vit. S. Will. 9, 187 (M. 101, 699 C) homo omni fera crudelior; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 159, 243 (M. 211, 447) atrociores omni bestia; compare Sen. ep. 107, 7 homo perniciosior feris omnibus; Anthol. Pal. 11, 348, 1 *θηρῶν βροτὲ μᾶλλον ἀνήμερε*.

BESTIA 5. Prudent. c. Symmach. 2, 816 sed tantum distant Romana et barbara, quantum | quadrupes abiuncta est bipedi; Nicol. Clar. ep. 56 (M. 196, 1651 B) vetus enim proverbium est et ore veterum celebrata sententia: quantum a belluis homines, tantum distant a laicis litterati.

BIPES, p. 56. Iuven. 9, 92 alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum.

[BIS. Plaut. Truc. 46 bis perit amator; Phaedr. 1, 21, 12 quod ferre cogor, certe bis videor mori; Ioh. Sar. ep. 91 (M. 199, 83 B) bis exsulat, qui domi exsulat; Publil. Syr. 50 (F.) bis una in morte alieno est arbitrio mori; 66 bis interimitur qui suis armis

<sup>1</sup> For the use of the name in Greek proverbs see M. Wiesenthal, p. 14, De nominibus propriis quae Graecis in proverbii fuerunt, Barmen, 1895; Schmidt, p. 51.

perit; act. inst. arch. Rom. 1876, p. 233 (Carm. Epigr. 945, 2 B.) quis] quis amat, valeat, pereat qui nescit amare, | bis tanto pereat quisquis amare vetat; CIL. 4, 1173 (Carm. Epigr. 946 B.). This hyperbole appears to have been quasi-proverbial; see also Plaut. Most. 375 PHIL. disperii. CA. bis peristi? qui potest?]

BONUS 4. Ovid her. 20 (21), 38 et proprio vulneror ipsa bono; fast. 5, 6 Copiaque ipsa nocet; Ovid a. a. 3, 584 saepe perit ventis obruta cumba suis; cf. *ager* 1.

BOS 4, p. 58. Weyman, ALL. 8, 25, cites Dümmler. The passages in Alcuin are ep. 75 (M. 100, 253 A); ep. 169 (441 D).

BRITANNIA, as remote. Mart. 11, 3, 5 dicitur et nostros cantare Britannia versus; Claudian. 5, 149 extremos ultra volitat gens si qua Britannos; compare *Thyle*, Otto, p. 348.

BRUMA, p. 59. Ovid rem. am. 492 frigidior glacie; her. 1, 22; ex Pont. 3, 4, 33; Petron. epigr. 107, 3 (PLM. 4, 101 Baehr.) quid nive frigidius? Aldh. de sept. et de metr. 14 D (M. 89, 198) frigidior brumis; Anselm Cant. ep. 1, 76 (M. 158, 1145 C) cor . . . glacie frigidius; Leonidas of Tarentum, Anthol. Pal. 16, 230, 6 *νῆμα, βορεινῆς ψυχρότερον νιφάδος*.

BRUTUS. The consulship of Brutus was a symbol of antiquity; Mart. 10, 39, 1 consule te Bruto . . . natam; 11, 44, 1 Bruto consule natus; compare *Numa*.

BUCCA 1, p. 59. Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 1, 139 (M. 144, 336) rustice proloquar et, ut ipsi dicunt, quicquid in buccam venerit, negligerter effundam; Gelas. I. adv. Androm. 1, p. 453, 21 (Günther).

BUCCA 2. Lucian, Icarom. 25<sup>1</sup>; Fritsche on Hor. sat. 1, 1, 21.

BULLA, p. 59. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, p. 126.

BUXUM. Ovid met. 4, 134 oraue buxo | pallidiora; met. 11, 417; Mart. 12, 32, 8 pallidus magis buxo; Priap. 32, 2; Apul. met. 8, 21 buxanti pallore; 9, 30 lurore buxio; Nemes. ecl. 2, 41 pallidior buxo; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 458.

CACOETHES. Juvenal's *scribendi cacoethes* appears as a citation in Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 291 B); enthet. 1501 (997 B).

CACUMEN. Sen. ep. 124, 8 cacumen radicis loco ponis; compare ben. 4, 2, 3 ista vero confusio est . . . primis postrema praeferre. The expression may have been proverbial.

CAECUS 1, p. 60. Sen. ep. 81, 25 manifestum etiam coniventi; Augustin. ep. 51, 5 (M. 33, 193) ea quae oculos etiam caecos

<sup>1</sup> E. Rowe, p. 16, Quaeritur quo iure Horatius in satiris Menippum imitatus esse dicatur, Halle, 1888.

feriunt, intuerere; cf. Plat. symp. 204 B δῆλον, εἶφη, τοῦτό γε ἤδη καὶ παίδι; Euthyd. 279 D; Eustath. Il. 1591, 46.<sup>1</sup>

CAECUS 2, p. 60. Alan. Insul. lib. par. 4 (M. 210, 589 B) caecus prohibetur ducere caecum; Planud. 254 (252) χειραγωγεῖ ὁ τυφλὸς τὸν μὴ βλέποντα; see Crusius, Rhein. Mus. 42, 423.

CAECUS 4. Commod. carm. apol. 76 et lumen offerimus caecis sine causa praebentes; Ruric. ep. 2, 26, p. 410, 23 (Eng.) sine causa enim solis ortum caecus expectat; cf. Paul. Emerit. vit. patr. 12 (M. 80, 147) sed quid caeco prodesse poterat iubar splendissimum solis?

CAECUS 5. Avit. Vienn. ep. 87, p. 267, 20 (Chev.) curari non potest quem caecum ire delectat; compare our English proverb, 'There are none so blind as those who won't see'; cf. Hier. ep. 48, 5 rogo, quae est ista contentio claudere oculos nec apertissimum lumen aspicere?

CAELUM 1, p. 60. Sulpic. 11, 3 (PLM. 5, 100 B.) et summa in imum vertit ac versa erigit.

CAELUM 3, p. 61. Petr. Bles. ep. 88 (M. 207, 276 C) de caelo in caenum; cf. Ps. Venant. Fort. de laud. Mar. 342 de limo in caelum.

CAELUM 3, p. 61, n. Nicol. Clar. ep. 38 (M. 196, 1636 A) partem animae meae receptam in caelum, partem relictam in caeno; Ioh. Sar. ep. 81 (M. 199, 68 C) caput quod in caelum erigitur, non aspernatur pedem, qui versatur in caeno.

CAELUM 6, p. 61. Hor. ep. 1, 11, 27 is cited frequently in mediaeval Latin; Othlo lib. prov. 3 (M. 146, 306 D); Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1094); Petr. Ven. ep. 2, 44 (M. 189, 267 A); ep. 6, 47 (470 A).

CAELUM 7, p. 61. Compare with Hor. c. 3, 3, 7, Symmach. ep. 1, 3, 4 sed fractae opes infractos animos reppererunt; Byzant. prov. 45 ὁ κόσμος ἐποντίζετο, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ στολίζετο.<sup>2</sup> Hor. c. 3, 3, 7 is cited by Hier. ep. 118, 2.

CAELUM 8, p. 62. Tibull. 4, 13, 13 nunc licet e caelo mittatur amica Tibullo, | mittetur frustra; Liv. 22, 29, 3 Fabiana se acies repente velut caelo demissa . . . ostendit (ALL. 7, 611); Cassiod. var. 2, 40, 11 loquamur de illo lapso caelo psalterio; Ioh. Sar. ep. 297 (M. 199, 345 D) de caelo siquidem, ut aiunt, descendit γνῶθι σεαυτὸν; Polycrat. 7, 12 (662 C) tertium Catonem e caelo miraberis cecidisse.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 311.

<sup>2</sup> Krumbacher, Sitzber. Münch. Akad. phil. hist., 1887, II, p. 70.

CAELUM 9, p. 62. Ennod. ep. 8, 5, p. 203, 23 (H.) si tales pascant, in caelis est; Placid. gloss., p. 18 (D.) caelebs enim dicitur, qui sine uxore est, quasi caelo beatus; Stat. silv. 1, 2, 213 ire polo nitidosque errare per axes | visus.

CAELUM 10, p. 63. Aetn. 227 caputque attollere caelo; Ovid ex Pont. 2, 2, 10 non ego concepi | clara mea tangi sidera posse manu; Ennod. dict. 8, p. 450, 5 (H.) in summa, ut dixi, caelum pulsant magistri opinio perfectione discipuli; Venant. Fort. vit. Hilar. 2, 3 ut pene mihi videatur aequale tam istud posse dicere quam digito caelum tangere; CIL. 8, 211 (Carm. Epigr. 1552 a, 78 B.) stat sublimis honor vicinaque nubila pulsant; Alan. Insul. praef. Anticlaud. (M. 210, 487 B) qui coelum philosophiae vertice pulsant; Theokr. 5, 144 ἐς ὠρανὸν ὑμιν ἀλεύμαι.<sup>1</sup>

CAELUM 11, p. 63. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 4, 5 (M. 199, 521 C) quo facto, se caelum Iovis tenere arbitratus est; compare *caelum* 9.

CAELUM 12. Hor. c. 1, 3, 38 nil mortalibus ardui est; | caelum ipsum petimus stultitia; Curt. 4, 10, 3 caelum vanis cogitationibus petere; Apul. de mund. pref., p. 287 (H.) peregrinari ausi sunt per coeli plagas; Min. Fel. Oct. 5, 6 caelum ipsum et ipsa sidera audaci cupiditate transcendimus; Iuven. 3, 78 (compare Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C)) Graeculus esuriens: in caelum, iusseris, ibit; Verg. Aen. 11, 351 caelum territatur armis (see Ladewig's note); Tibull. 1, 10, 60 e caelo deripit ille deos (see Wunderlich ad loc.); Propert. 2, 32, 50 tu prius et fluctus poteris siccare marinos | altaque mortali deripere astra manu; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 56, 73 (M. 211, 351) de numero sunt eorum qui violenti diripiunt caelum. Crusius, Herondas, p. 96, cites the Greek proverb ἐς οὐρανὸν τοξεύειν (Zenob. 3, 46) as a symbol of useless daring; compare Sen. d. 7, 27, 1 nam cum in caelum insanitis . . . operam perditis; d. 6, 18, 7 videbis nihil humanae audaciae intemptatum.

CAELUM 13. Optat. Mil. ep. 3, 3, p. 80, 7 (Ziwsa) illud enim, quod ab eo petebatur, adhuc in caelo erat, et insipientis esset huius rei quasi mercedem accipere, quam nondum habuit in potestate; compare *aer* 1, Otto, p. 6.

CAELUM 14. Macrobi. sat. 5, 13, 32 cum res aliqua a terra in caelum nota sit; compare Paulin. Nol. ep. 8, 3, p. 50, v. 63 (H.) quanta etenim caelo ac terris distantia.

<sup>1</sup> A. Baar, p. 10, Sprichwörter und sentenzen aus den griech. idyllendichtern, Görz, 1887.

CAELUM 15. Ovid fast. 2, 138 quodcumque est alto sub Iove, Caesar habet; Apul. flor. 22, 102 quicquid sub caelo divitiarum est; Euseb. Pamphil. vit. Constant. 2, 22 (M. 8, 44 A) quale nulla umquam sub caelo vidisset aetas; Petr. Cell. ep. 156 (M. 202, 599 D) de omni gente quae sub caelo est; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 D) nihil est quod sit sub caelo carius emptum; compare Prudent. cath. 915 quaque in his vigeat sub alto solis et lunae globo; Hrosuitha Mon. com. Gall. 2, 1 (M. 137, 989 C) in aestimatione aeternae vitae flocci facio quicquid habetur sub sole.

CAELUM 16. Gell. 13, 31, 1 homo inepte gloriosus, tamquam unus esset in omni caelo saturarum M. Varronis enarrator.<sup>1</sup>

CAENUM 2, p. 63. Alcuin ep. 118 (M. 100, 352 C) qui te de stercore erexit; Commodian. instruc. 2, 20, 1 de cloaca levatus. With the Greek phrase ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσθαι compare Sen. ep. 94, 58 involuta caeno suo iacent; Hier. ep. 51, 7 per has in caenum demersi sunt peccatorum; ep. 147, 9 totus in caeno iaces.

CALCARE, p. 64. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 3, 27 sed et insultare iacenti te mihi fama refert; trist. 2, 571 nec mihi credibile est, quemquam insultasse iacenti; CIL. 6, 28695 (Carm. Epigr. 1145, 1 B.) te rogo, praeteries, ut parcas calcare iacente; CIL. 6, 29947; Meleagr. Anthol. Pal. 12, 48, 1 κείμαι· λὰξ ἐπίβαινε κατ' αὐχένος, ἄγριε δαίμον; with the thought compare Petron. 128 noli suggillare miseras, 'Don't hit a man when he's down.' See *iacere*.

CALCHAS, as a stock name for a soothsayer. Plaut. Merc. 945 Calchas iste quidem Zacynthiust; Anth. Pal. 7, 688, 1 δύο Κάλχαντες; see further Wiesenthal, p. 51.

[CALCHAS 2. Plaut. Men. 748 novi cum Calcha simul; | eodem die illum vidi quo te ante hunc diem.]

CALCULUS 1, p. 64. Petr. Bles. ep. 151 (M. 207, 442 C) omnes dies meos meliore lapillo . . . computabam. On the general idea see Tibull. 1, 3, 93 aurora candida; Petron. 127, v. 7 candidiorque dies secreto favit amor; Ovid ex Pont. 4, 4, 18 candidus et felix proximus annus erit; Stat. silv. 1, 2, 24 ergo dies aderat Parcarum conditus albo | vellere; Sidon. Apoll. c. 14, 1 prosper conubio dies coruscat, | quem Clotho niveis benigna pensis | . . . signet; Ovid a. a. 1, 418 atra dies; compare Macar. 5, 51 λευκή ἡμέρα; see H. Koch, II, p. 24, for Greek parallels.

[CALIDUS 1, p. 65. For a similar use of the adjective compare Plaut. Mil. 226 cedo calidum consilium cito; Epid. 141 quadriginta minis | celeriter calidis; 283 tum tu igitur calide, quicquid

<sup>1</sup> O. Gorges, p. 70, De sermonis Gelliani proprietatibus, Halle, 1883.

acturu's, age; Cic. offic. 1, 24, 82 calida consilia; de invent. 2, 9, 28.]

CALX 2, p. 66. Hier. adv. Rufin. 3, 7 (M. 23, 484 B) velut si quis pugnis aliquem calcibusque collidens . . . dicat ei; Sangall. gloss. 912, M. 145 (Warren) mulcat: pugnis vel calcibus cedit (= caedit).

CALX 3, p. 66. Ennod. ep. 1, 14, p. 25, 2 (H.) quis ad calcem perductas anxietates suas reparet? Boeth. contr. Eutych. et Nest. pref., p. 188, 49 (Peiper) ubi ad calcem ducta constiterint; Eustath. Il. 802, 14 ἐκ βαλβίδων.<sup>1</sup> For life as a race-course see Crusius, Herond., p. 165.

CAMELUS 2. Apul. met. 7, 14 faenumque camelo Bactrinae sufficiens apponi, sounds proverbial.

CAMILLUS, p. 68. Propert. 3, 9, 31 magnos aequabunt ista Camillos | iudicia; Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 8, 2 Serranorum aemulus et Camillorum; Ennod., p. 327, 15 (H.); Hier. ep. 58, 5 Camillos, Fabricios.

CANIS 1, p. 68. Hor. sat. 1, 7, 25 Canem illum, with a play on the word as in *Regem*, v. 35; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 17, p. 98, 12 (H.) isti verius dicendi canes; for Greek parallels, J. Koch, p. 16.

CANIS 3, p. 69. Hier. adv. Helv. 22 (M. 23, 216 B) caninam facundiam; ep. 144, 1; Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 D); 12 (658 D) ac secundum Appium caninam videamur exercere facundiam; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 28 (M. 199, 634 D) et me in eos velle, ut dici solet, caninam facundiam exercere.

CANIS 9, p. 70. Iuven. 15, 159 parcit | cognatis maculis similis fera; schol. ad loc. id est, nec serpens serpentem comedit; Hor. epod. 7, 11 neque hic lupis mos nec fuit leonibus, | numquam nisi in dispar feris (cited by Otto, *ursus* 3); Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 21, 49 (M. 144, 252) strix malefica, etiamsi alienam sanguinem fundit, suis tamen pignoribus parcit; Macar. 5, 36; for Greek parallels, J. Koch, p. 20.

CANIS 11, p. 71. Mart. 5, 44, 8 captus es unctiore mensa | et maior rapuit canem culina, according to Friedländer is a probable reminiscence of Hor. sat. 2, 5, 83, which is also cited by Petr. Bles. ep. 15 (M. 207, 55 B); Alan. de Insul. (M. 210, 581 C) non leviter corio canis abstrahetur ab uncto; Alciphro. 3, 47 οὐδὲ γὰρ κύων σκυτοπραγεῖν μαθοῦσα τῆς τέχνης ἐπιλήσεται; see Barta, l. c., p. 24; Schmidt, p. 82; Tribukait, p. 31.

<sup>1</sup> Kurtz, p. 311.

CANOPUS, as a place of loose morals. Iuven. 15, 46 sed luxuria, quantum ipse notavi, | barbara famoso non cedit turba Canopo; 6, 84 et mores urbis damnante Canopo; Sen. ep. 51, 3 quamvis neminem Canopus esse frugi vetet.

CAPER 2, p. 73. Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 382 B) ne foveat litem lana caprina diu; Polycrat. 7, 9 (653 D) paratus et de lana caprina contendere, credens inopinabile; enthet. 182 (969 B) cui longam litem lana caprina facit.

CAPILLUS 2, p. 74. Crusius, Herond., p. 102, connects the remark with the wiping of hands on the hair spoken of in Petron. 27 and 57.

CAPITOL. Verg. Aen. 9, 448 dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum | accolet (cited by Sen. ep. 21, 5); Stat. silv. 1, 6, 101 dum stabit tua Roma dumque terris | quod reddis Capitolium manebit; cf. Iuven. 9, 131 numquam . . . derit amicus | stantibus et salvis his collibus.

CAPUT 4, p. 75. Plaut. Rud. 885 isti capiti dicito; Sen. ben. 4, 31, 4 quicquid, inquit, mali dixi, mihi et capiti meo; cf. d. 6, 9, 4.

CAPUT 5. Flav. Vopsic. Tac. 5, 2 Severus dixit, caput imperare non pedes, has the sound of a proverbial expression.

CAR, p. 75. For the contempt in which the Carians were held compare Diogen. 6, 24 *Λυδοὶ πονηροὶ, δεύτεροι δ' Αἰγύπτιοι, τρίτοι, δὲ πάντων Κᾶρες ἐξωλέστανται*; Plat. Lach. 187 B; Euthyd. 285 B<sup>1</sup>; see J. Koch, p. 38.

CARDO, p. 76. Sen. ben. 4, 22, 1 in illo tamen cardine positi; compare *articulus* 2.

CATILINA (compare *Cato*). Sid. Apoll. ep. 2, 1, 1 rediit iste Catilina saeculi nostri; Sen. d. 6, 20, 5 tantum Catilinarum; d. 10, 5, 1 M. Cicero inter Catilinas<sup>2</sup>; Prudent. in Symmach. 1, 529 multos Catilinas | ille domo pepulit; Hier. ep. 138, 1.

CATO 1, p. 78. Sen. d. 6, 25, 2 excipit illum coetus sacer, Scipiones Catonesque; Sen. rhet. contr. 10, 1, 8 innocentior Catone; Augurinus in Plin. ep. 4, 27, 4 ille, o, Plinius, ille quot Catones; Sid. Apoll. c. 2, 474 pugnaces ego pauper laudo Catones; Fulgent. M. 1, 15 Catonum rigores; Cassiod. var. 1, 27, 4; 2, 3, 4 fuit quidam nostrorum temporum Cato; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 21 (M. 199, 691 B) Catone rigidior; Alan. Insul. (M. 210, 583 C) si Cato sis, et vis in candida vertere nigra, | curia sit curae.

<sup>1</sup> E. Grünwald, p. 8, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche redensarten bei Plato, Berlin, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> See also Woelfflin, ALL. 9, 458.

CENA, p. 80. Theokr. 7, 24 ἡ μετὰ δαίτ' ἄκλῆτος ἐπείγεται; see Tribukait, p. 56.

CENSORIUS, p. 80. Ammian. Marcell. 18, 1, 4 inusitato censorio vigore; Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 3, 5 inter alabastra censorium. For a similar use in Greek of Ἀρεοπαγίτης see Schmidt, p. 101.

CENTO, p. 80. See Crusius, Herond., p. 149.

CERA 1, p. 80. Iuven. 7, 237 mores teneros ceu pollice ducat, | ut si quis cera voltum facit; Ovid met. 10, 284 ut . . . sole | cera remollescit.

CERA 4, as a symbol of whiteness. Ovid ex Pont. 1, 10, 28 membraque sunt cera pallidiora nova; Hor. c. 1, 13, 2 cerea Telephi | laudas braccia; see Crusius, Herond., p. 133.

CERTUS 1, p. 81. Lucan epigr. Saturn. (Baehr., Frag. Poet. Rom., p. 367) nemo nimis cupide sibi rem desideret ullam, | ne, cum plus cupiat, perdat et hoc quod habet; Eumen. panegr. Constant. 15 (M. 8, 633 C) ut praesentibus careant, dum futura prospectant; Walter Burley de vit. et mor. phil. et poet. plurimi sua amittunt dum aliena appetunt (Haupt, Philol. 3, 377, No. 26); compare Sen. d. 10, 9, 1 expectatio, quae pendit ex crastino, perdit hodiernum, where the alliteration should be noted; append. prov. 4, 7; Stob. flor. 10, 69 Δημοκρίτου τοῦ πλέονος ἐπιθυμία, τὸ παρὲν ἀπόλλυσι; schol. Theokr. 11, 75.<sup>1</sup>

CERTUS 2, p. 81. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 48, p. 85, 28 (Reiff.) omni vero verissimum est certoque certissimum<sup>2</sup>; dig. 42, 8, 10, 14; Ambros. ep. ad Ephes. 5; sermo Leoni Magn. adscript. 20, 3; Thom. Cant. ep. 25 (M. 190, 477 A) certo certius est; Ioh. Sar. ep. 222 (M. 199, 250 A) certo autem certius est; Script. Lango-bard., p. 455, 26 certo certius teneant; 456, 12. Such expressions are merely due to colloquial intensity; compare Plaut. Poen. 991 Nullus mest hodie Poenus Poenior; 1290 atritate atrior multo ut siet; Capt. 150 tibi ille unicus, mi etiam unico magis unicus; see further Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 449.

CERVUS 1, p. 81. Compare Auson. ecl. 5, 4, p. 93 (Peiper) et quater egreditur cornicis, saecula cervus; compare *cornix* 1.

CERVUS 2, p. 81. Hor. c. 2, 16, 23 ocior cervis; Ennod., p. 504, 14 (H.) qui cervam velocitate praecessit; Paulin. Nol. ep. 9, 4, p. 55, 17 (H.) alacritate cervorum; Ioh. Sar. ep. 194 (M. 199, 214 B)

<sup>1</sup> P. Martin, p. 34, Studien auf dem gebiete des griech. sprichwortes, Plauen, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> For the use of the superlative as a comparative see Reifferscheid's index, p. 307.

Ashael velocitate cervos . . . anteibat; compare Sen. ep. 76, 8 commendat . . . velocitas cervum; Cassiod. var. 4, 1, 3. To Weyman, ALL. 8, 401, add Ps.-Cypr., p. 149, 13 (H., vol. III) clodos currere fecisti velut cervos; Ioh. Sar. ep. 250 (M. 199, 294 C) saliat sicut cervus claudus.

CHARYBDIS, p. 82. Sen. suas. 6, 5 quae Charybdis est tam vorax? append. sent. 173 (R.) Charybdis inplacata est iracundia; Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 20, 38 (M. 144, 240) postquam te huic periculoso negotio tamquam Scyllaeae voraginis fluctibus immersisti; serm. 15, 74 (583) et non, quod absit, vorago nos Syllaeae profunditatis absorbeat; Abaelard. ep. 5 (M. 178, 206 B) a quanta Charybdis voragine . . . extraxerit; ep. 1 (132 B) ne te praecipitem haec Charybdis absorbeat; Ioh. Sar. carm. de membr. (M. 199, 1006 A) dicite, quid tantam possit satiare Charybdin? ep. 322 (373 D) inter Syllam et Charybdim periculosius navigantes; Polycrat. 5, 12 (572 D) sed neminem vidi qui Syllam vitaret et Charybdim, nisi debilem aut propitium sustinuerit hostem; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 189, 291 (M. 211, 474); compare Braulio ep. 21 (M. 80, 670 B) inter scopulos tentationum et Charybdim voluptatum; for Greek parallels see J. Koch, p. 51.

CICADA I, p. 83. Apost. 16, 37 τέττιγος εὐφρονότερος; see Tribukait, p. 21; Schmidt, p. 118.

CIMMERII, p. 83. Compare Anthol. Pal. 5, 283, 6 εἴ τις Ἑρώτων | λάτρης, νύκτας ἔχειν ὄφελε Κιμμερίων, referring to the length of the night; cf. 5, 223, 6.

CIRCE I, p. 84. Compare Claudian. c. 22, 134 membraque Circaeis effeminat acrius herbis; 26, 441 non sine Circaeis Latonia reddidit herbis.

CIRCE 2, as a stock enchantress. Plaut. Epid. 604 hanc adserva Circam, Solis filiam; see Suidas under Κίρκη, and Wiesenthal, p. 58. The old explanation which is given to the passage in Gray's edition of the Epidicus, 'quia nec patrem nec matrem novit,' does not appear to me satisfactory. Acropolistis is a 'witch' who has skilfully conducted a very successful metamorphosis.

CLAVUS 2, p. 85. Helois. ad Abael. ep. 6 (M. 178, 213 B) ut enim insertum clavum alius expellit, sic cogitatio nova priorem excludit; Apost. 8, 52; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 3, 60 with Leutsch's note, Martin., p. 33.

CLEOPATRA. Sid. Apoll. ep. 8, 12, 8 dapes Cleopatricas; compare Otto under *Apicius*.

CLIVUS, p. 86. For the metaphorical use of the word compare

Sen. d. 7, 15, 5 illius gradu clivus iste frangendus est; Ovid rem. am. 394 is cited by Hildebert. ep. 1, 11 (M. 171, 168 C).

COLERE. Arnob. adv. nat. 3, 11, p. 119, 20 (Reiff.) quos vident et sentiunt neque se colere neque deridere, quod dicitur.

COLUMBA 1, p. 88. Ovid met. 5, 605 ut fugere accipitrem penna trepidante columbae.

COLUMBA 2, p. 88. Maecen. in Sen. ep. 114, 5 labris columbatur; Petr. Cell. ep. 134 (M. 202, 579 C) praebeant columbina oscula; compare Propert. 2, 15, 27 exemplo iunctae tibi sint in amore columbae; 1, 9, 5 non me Chaoniae vincant in amore columbae.

CONFIDERE. Caecil. 248 (R.) si confidentiam adhibes, confide omnia; Sen. ep. 3, 2 si aliquem amicum existimas, cui non tantumdem credis quantum tibi, vehementer erras.

CORBIS (compare Otto under *modius*). Plaut. Bacch. 712 si id capso, geritote amicis vestris aurum corribus.

CORINTHUS. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 23 (M. 199, 622 B) frequens illud proverbium apud Graecos; frustra quis Corinthum tendit ad Laidem nisi queat, aut velit dare quae poscitur. This corresponds to the view taken of this proverb in Zenob. 5, 37 and Diogen. 7, 16; see, in general, Otto's discussion.

[CORNIX 1, p. 93. Regarding the long life of the crow see Sen. ben. 2, 29, 1 nos vincant . . . spatio aetatis corvi; Macrobi. sat. 7, 5, 11; Auson. ecl. 5, 3; Friedländer on Mart. 10, 67, 5; Phaedr. append. 24, 7.]

CORNU 1, p. 93. Ovid fast. 2, 346 cornu durius; Sid. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 3 corneum femur; ep. 3, 13, 9.

CORNU 2, p. 93. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C) quia et nos iuxta Flaccum didicimus litterulas . . . et de nobis dici potest; fenum habet in cornu, longe fuge; Anselm. Cant. ep. 2, 2 (M. 158, 1066 C) non habet fenum in cornu . . . sed posteriora videte; fenum habet in cauda; cauda ferit ille, cavete.

CORNU 4, p. 94. Thom. Cant. ep. 7 (M. 190, 448 D) hi sunt, pater, qui dant cornua peccatori; amic. ap. Thom. Cant. ep. 390 (730 B) cornua attulit peccatori.

CORVUS 5, Szel., p. 18. Compare Eurip. fr. 273 (N.) πτηνὰς διώκεις, ὃ τέκνον, τὰς ἐλπίδας (Apost. 12, 100); Plat. Euthyph. 4 A πετόμενόν τινα διώκεις; Aristot. metaph. 3, 5; see J. Koch, p. 20; Gildersleeve on Pers. 3, 61.

COTHURNUS 1, p. 95. H. Gölzer, p. iv,<sup>1</sup> cites the proverb,

<sup>1</sup> Gram. in Sulpic. Sev. observationes, Paris, 1883.

Gallicanus cothurnus, from Hier. ep. 58, 10, in reference to the overloaded style of Gallic writers.

CRAS 2, p. 96. Cf. Ps.-Plin. 1, 4 hodie quod est, cras non est; see Tribukait, p. 12; Baar, p. 9; Heraeus Petr., p. 37.

CRASSUS, p. 96. Cic. ad Attic. 1, 4, 3 quod si adsequor, supero Crassum divitiis; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 1171 (M. 199, 990 D) captat opes Crassus.

CREDERE 3, p. 97. Ps.-Publil. Syr. 381 (F.) utrumque vitium est nulli et credere omnibus (see Friedrich ad loc.); Hildebert. ep. 3, 34 (M. 171, 309 A) Sicut Seneca testatur, et omni et nulli credere vitium est.

CREPIDA, p. 97. Paulin. Nol. ep. 12, 3, p. 75, 18 (H.) figulo tantum in argillam suam ius est; the same idea seems to be present in Anthol. Pal. 10, 48, 1 μήποτε δουλεύσασα γυνή δέσποινα γένοιτο, | ἐστὶ παροιμιακόν.

CRETA, p. 98. Anthol. Pal. 7, 275, 6 Κρήτες . . . ψεύδονται.

CROESUS, p. 98. Sid. Apoll. c. 9, 33 cuius non valuit rapacitatem | vel Lydi satiare gaza Croesi; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 664 C) plus effusum pecuniae, quam in omnibus divitiis suis possiderit Croesus; Phil. Harv. ep. 4 (M. 203, 33 B) divitiae Croesi; Anth. Pal. 11, 3, 1 ἤθελον ἂν πλουτεῖν, ὥς πλούσιος ἦν ποτε Κροῖσος; for citations from Lucian see Schmidt, p. 102.

CUCURBITA 2, p. 100. See Hildebrand on Apul. m. 5, 9.

CUNABULA, p. 101. Venant. Fort. vit. S. Hilar. 1, 2 ab ipsis cunabulis; Hier. ep. 52, 4 ab incunabulis fidei; Cassiod. var. 1, 21, 1 ubi ab ipsis cunabulis commoratur; 12, 15, 2; 6, 21, 1 quanto melius in ipsis cunabulis adhuc mollia reprimere; 5, 15, 2 dum in ipsis cunabulis scelera . . . resecantur; Ethelw. to Aldh. ep. 6 (M. 89, 98 A) ab ipsis tenerrimae cunabulis infantiae; Benedict. Crisp. prooem. poem. (M. 89, 369 B) pene ab ipsis cunabulis educavi; Dud. Dec. (M. 141, 610 B) ab ipsa cunabulari vita; Foliot ep. 157 (M. 190, 861 D) notum quippe . . . satis ab ipsis fere cunabulis; Petr. Bles. ep. 94 (M. 207, 294 A) a pueritiae cunabulis; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 101, 146 (M. 211, 392) a cunabulis semper dilexistis; compare Hier. de vir. illustr. II, p. 8, 2 (Herdington) hic de utero matris sanctus fuit; Paulin. to Augustin. ep. 25, 4 (M. 33, 102) segregare me ab utero matris meae; Nicol. Clar. ep. 16 (M. 196, 611 D) fere enim ab uberibus matris tuae collocatus es in sanctuarium; note also Petr. Ven. ep. 1, 34 (M. 189, 166 D) a primo, ut dicitur, foundationis lapide; ep. 4, 26 (M. 189, 357 B).

CUNEUS, p. 102. The proverb is cited by Abbo Flor. ep. 14 (M. 139, 443 A) recordare proverbii; malo arboris etc.

CURIA. Verg. Aen. 11, 380 non replenda est curia verbis; for a discussion of the proverb see Crusius, Herond., p. 137; Herond. 7, 49 ἀλλ' οὐ λόγων γάρ, φασίν, ἡ ἀγορὰ δέϊται.

CURIUS, p. 102. Add Sen. ep. 120, 19; Ennod., p. 327, 15 (H.); Claudian. c. 15, 111.

CURRERE, p. 102.<sup>1</sup> Sen. ep. 34, 2 sed iam currentem hortor; ep. 109, 6 nihilominus adiuvant etiam currentem hortaturi; Ennod. ep. 8, 40, p. 226, 2 (H.) stimulare currentem; Symmach. ep. 4, 20, 2 proximis facundiae calcibus urguet parentem; Novat. 19 (ALL. 11, 226) incitem paratos; Eustath. Il. 713, 59 σπεύδοντα ὀρρύνεις; 1033, 4<sup>2</sup>; cf. Symmach. ep. 5, 94, 1 bona voluntas . . . non sit agitanda calcaribus; Ennod. ep. 9, 30, p. 252, 16 (H.) qui volentem coegerit, non laborat.

[CURRERE 2. Propert. 4, 7, 84 sed breve, quod currens vector ab urbe legat, sounds proverbial.]

CUTIS 1, p. 104. Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 132 Zmyrnaeae cute doctus officinae; Pers. 3, 30 is cited by Gualbert. act. 52 (M. 146, 834 B), and by Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1629 B).

CUTIS 1, n., p. 104. Sen. ep. 72, 5 sed id leve et quod summam cutem stringat; Prudent. psych. 506 vix in cute summa | prae-stringens paucos tenui de vulnere laedit | cuspis Avaritiae.

CUTIS 3, p. 104. Theobald. Stamp. ep. 4 (M. 163, 766 B) cuti curandae curiose studentes; Petr. Bles. ep. 94 (M. 207, 296 A) cites Hor. ep. 1, 2, 29.

CYCNUS 1, p. 104. Verg. ecl. 7, 38 Galatea . . . candidior cycnis (ALL. 6, 457).

CYCNUS 2, p. 104. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 6 (M. 199, 552 C) inter congarrientes perstrepat, veluti rabulus anser admistus oloribus; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 856 B) sed parumper in auribus vestris liceat inter olores anserem strepere; see Tribukait, p. 29.

CYCNUS 3, p. 105. With the thought compare Ovid trist. 5, 1, 11 utque iacens ripa deflere Caystrius ales | dicitur ore suam deficiente necem; Stat. silv. 2, 4, 10 non soli celebrant sua funera cygni; Lucian Tim. 47 ὀδικώτερον εἶναι τῶν κύκνων; Anthol. Pal. 7, 12, 2 κυκνεῖω . . . στόματι; 9, 92, 2.

M. C. SUTPHEN.

<sup>1</sup>See O. Hauschild, De proprietatibus sermonis quae in Philippicis Ciceronis orationibus inveniuntur, dissert. Hal. VI, p. 275.

<sup>2</sup>Kurtz, p. 318.

## II.—A STUDY OF THE LEYDEN MS OF NONIUS MARCELLUS.

Following the example of Mr. T. W. Allen and others, who have recently published careful studies of the chief MSS of Plato, Sophocles and Aristophanes, I will in this article attempt a detailed examination of the 'codex optimus' (L) of Nonius Marcellus, with the object of gleaningsome information about the archetype and the history of the transmission of the text.

The Leyden MS (Voss. Lat., fol. 73), of the ninth century, written in Caroline minuscules on 253 leaves, with two columns (each of 22 lines) to the page, comes from the Monastery of St. Martin at Tours and is one of the MSS selected by M. Delisle (Mém. Acad. Inscr. XXXII 29 sqq.) as a specimen of the calligraphy of Tours—that is to say, of the best work produced in the best scriptorium of all Europe. The care bestowed on this copy of the *Compendiosa Doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus is seen in the fact that the whole work, from beginning to end, has been revised by two correctors (L<sup>2</sup> and L<sup>3</sup>), who have not been content with punctuation and emendation of the text and with correction of the spelling. In the division of words between the lines they have interfered whenever Priscian's rules of syllable-division were broken. Thus on fol. 11 r. i *rec|ta* has been changed by L<sup>2</sup> to *re|cta* and on fol. 14 r. i *pub|lica* by L<sup>3</sup> to *pu|blica*. And even, a rare example of careful calligraphy, the correct division of consonant-groups in words at other parts of the line has been indicated by subscript commas throughout the volume, e. g. (fol. 1 r.) *inhone,stis; di,ctis; indi,cretis; si,gnificatione; di,ctum; o,mnibus; sene,ctutem*, etc.

The scribes too have done their work well. All editors allow L<sup>1</sup>—i. e. the uncorrected transcript—to be the closest reproduction of the lost archetype. The only MS that can stand beside it is the Geneva MS (Gen.), which contains only book IV, and which belongs to the end of the ninth century. The consensus of L<sup>1</sup> and Gen.<sup>1</sup> gives us unmistakably the actual text of the original, with its barbarous spellings (e. g. 382 M(ercier) 24 Hecyra] hequirā L<sup>1</sup>Gen.<sup>1</sup>; 241 M. 33-34 absinti... acerbum]

absenthi . . . acervum L<sup>1</sup>Gen.; 246 M. 31 Zephyrumque] zefeurumque L<sup>1</sup>Gen.<sup>1</sup>) and illiterate word-division (e. g. 258 M. 7 satin astu] saginas tu), the unemended, or not fully emended, form in which the text of our author passed from the Dark Ages into the hands of Carolingian scholars. L<sup>2</sup> and L<sup>3</sup> aim at adapting this to the standard of correct Latinity, but in so doing often suppress a genuine form or its trace, e. g. 443. 23 nomen habet] nominavet L<sup>1</sup>, nominavit L corr.

It is therefore to L<sup>1</sup> (and in book IV to Gen.<sup>1</sup> also) that we must look for light on the nature and composition of the archetype of our MSS. That all MSS of Nonius come from one archetype has long been recognized from their transposition of a passage of book IV (406 M. 12—409 M. 15) to near the beginning of book I (3 M. 13). This passage of book IV appears to have filled a single leaf of the archetype. The leaf became loose and dropped out, and, instead of being put back in its proper place, was slipped in after the first leaf of the whole work. We can thus estimate the size of a page of our archetype as about a page and a half of Mercier's edition. Now we get a clue to the size of the page of the immediate original of L from a mistake by the scribe of L at 379 M. 17. After the words *iam tum religio* there follow 380 M. 41 sqq. *Verg. lib. XI multa dies* etc. The most natural explanation of this mistake, a mistake not shared by the other MSS, is that the scribe had 'skipped' a page (or leaf) of his original. The amount omitted corresponds to what we have found to be the content of a page of the archetype. This suggests at least the possibility of our archetype, which had a leaf of book IV loose, having been also the immediate original from which L was transcribed.

It is well known that the pagination of an archetype is often reproduced in a copy. Thus the Pithoean MS (P) of Juvenal is assumed to reproduce the pagination of the archetype of all the minuscule MSS, because XVI 60, the line immediately preceding the lacuna which characterized that archetype, is also in P the last line of the last page.<sup>1</sup> This practice was found convenient when the task of transcription was distributed among several

<sup>1</sup> It is a strong argument for the genuineness of the passage discovered by Mr. Winstedt in a Bodleian MS (Class. Rev. XIII 201) that its content suits the theory of its absence from our MSS being due to the accidental loss of a leaf from the archetype and not to any doubt about the authenticity of the lines.

scribes who worked simultaneously at different parts of the text. Suppose the original, of which a copy was desired, consisted of 80 pages (i. e. of 40 leaves or folia, i. e. of 5 quaternions), the first and fourth quaternions might be assigned to one monk, the second and fifth to another, the third to another; and the most certain way of ensuring that each transcriber should not find himself inconvenienced by having too much or too little parchment for his task, would be to make the three transcribe each and every page of their original exactly on one page of their transcript. This practice, more available for transcribers of poetry than of prose, has clearly not been followed by the scribe of L, if L was transcribed immediately from the archetype; for the transposed passage from book IV occupies in L not a single leaf, but three pages and one column, and the preceding part of book I, along with the index of contents and title-heading, takes up the same amount. Fol. 2 r. i ends *pausimachomum IN* and fol. 3 v. ii ends *nascitur leat*. Indeed, the calligraphic nature of L, with its large, uncramped, regular script, is inconsistent with a slavish reproduction of the form of, let us say, a Merovingian original. But that the transcription of the various parts of the original by the scribes of the Leyden MS was simultaneous there is some indication. Just before fol. 147 r., where a new hand appears, the writing of the concluding portion of the previous gathering is spaced out and straggling, so as to cover as much ground and leave as little of the page blank as possible.

The *Compendiosa Doctrina* of Nonius is, in accordance with the fashion that prevailed in works of this class in ancient times, divided into twenty books. But several of these books (or rather chapters) are of very limited extent, and one (the fourth) is of exceptional length. If divided according to bulk, the work falls naturally into three parts, the first containing books I-III, the second, book IV; the third, books V-XX. And a division of this kind, possibly due to the mere breaking up of an archetype into these three sections, is traceable in our MSS; for some (e. g. the Geneva MS) contain only book IV, others (e. g. the Florence MS) only books I-III; while others that contain the whole are clearly transcripts from different originals in these three portions (e. g. the Harleian (H) is in books I-III a transcript of the Florence MS; in book IV, of the Geneva MS; in books V-XX, of some lost original), or even (as in the case of the Paris Nonius) are, in reality, mere accidental combinations of originally distinct MSS.

It is one of the merits of the Leyden Codex that it is in all probability a whole transcript of a whole original. The transcription has been apportioned among three scribes and in this fashion:

1st scribe: foll. 1-94 r. (= pp. 1-170 M. 22 *M. Tullius*), 167 r.—252 (= pp. 365 M. 18—557 M.).

2d scribe: foll. 94 v.—146 v. (= 170 M. 22—314 M. 14 *multum*).

3d scribe: foll. 147 r.—166 v. (= 314 M. 14—364 M. 18 *conpertum est*).

In other words, the first scribe wrote book I and nearly the whole of book II (occupying some twelve quaternions), the second finished book II and wrote book III and the first half of book IV, the third wrote the third quarter of book IV; the first scribe then finished the volume. The lion's share of the work has thus been effected by the first scribe.<sup>1</sup> He made a separate numbering of the quaternions used by him in the second part of his task, but his numbers i, ii, iii, etc., have been altered later (by L<sup>2</sup>?), so that i becomes xxii, ii becomes xxiii, iii becomes xxiv, and so on. Near the end of the first quaternion in this second half of his labours, he omitted accidentally, through homoeoteleuton, a long passage of his original (379. 16 *Virg.*—380. 41 *libro XI*). To supply the deficiency a broad sheet (i. e. two leaves) was utilized, which had been discarded from some transcript of Priscian's Institutes, and which bore on one leaf the title-heading in gold letters: PRISCIANVS GRAMMATICVS | CVM OMNIS. On its other leaf the omitted passage of Nonius was written (in a new handwriting), and inserted in the gathering, so that the quaternion becomes a quinion, with 10 leaves instead of 8, the blank leaf being fol. 168 and the written leaf fol. 175 of our MS. I have been unable to ascertain whether this Priscian MS is still in existence.

For the sake of completeness it may be as well to give here an account of the arrangement of our MS in quaternions, although this was a mere affair of the supply of material to the scribes, and does not throw light on the nature of the archetype. (I follow the account entered by the Leyden librarian on the fly-leaf):—

Foll. 1-8 quaternionio,  
9-14 ternio,

<sup>1</sup> I think that 364 M. 18—366 M. 14 *adfigebatur*, occupying four columns, i. e. one leaf, is in the handwriting of the first scribe. But it may be in a fourth handwriting.

Foll. 15-118 quaterniones,  
 119-129 quinio + 1 fol.,  
 130-137 quaternio,  
 138-146 quaternio, cui unum folium (139) additum est,  
     scilicet ut textus congrueret cum sequentis quaternionis contextu, qui iam conscribi coeptus erat,  
 147-154 quaternio,  
 155-164 quinio,  
 165-166 duo folia,  
 167-176 quinio,  
 177 sqq. quaterniones,  
 253 vacuum.

More important for us is an examination of the procedure followed in the correction of the transcript. There were, as has been mentioned, two separate correctors whose services were given to our MS. In Prof. Lucian Mueller's critical apparatus they are merged under the symbol  $L^2$ ; and even corrections by the scribe himself are often included under this designation. Where the correction consists of a single stroke or dot or an erasure, it is often hardly possible to assign it with certainty to  $L^1$  or  $L^2$  or  $L^3$ . But in the majority of cases we can distinguish fairly enough between the two correctors and keep their emendations separate from the mere correction by the scribe at the moment of transcription. The corrector, whom I call  $L^2$ , has left us a good specimen of his handwriting on fol. 181 r. and fol. 220 v. His revision was prior to that of  $L^3$ , for  $L^3$  often confirms (by a dot or the like) the corrections of  $L^2$  (e. g. 298 M. 8 *implere*  $L^1$ , *implere*  $L^2$ , confirmed by  $L^3$ ), and in the passage added by  $L^2$  on fol. 188 r. ii (p. 405 M. 29)  $L^3$  changes *ho* to *hoc*.

Both are later than the rubricator, as we see from fol. 178 v., where the word *Aequales* was written *quale* by the scribe, with space left for the initial. The rubricator has supplied an initial *E* (i. e. *Egualē*); but  $L^2$  has put *A* before this, so as to make the word *Aequale*.  $L^3$  has added a final *s*, producing *Aequales*. At 225 M. 32  $L^3$  has stroked out the rubricated initial *S* of *segetem* and has replaced it with a small *s*. A good specimen of the handwriting of  $L^3$  is seen in his lengthy addition in the upper margin of fol. 202 v.

A corrector would, of course, make many emendations by his own impulse, but in the main would follow some text of the

author, either the actual text of which a transcript had been made, or another text. Our correctors seem to have taken down from the library-shelves two other copies of the text of Nonius to help them in emending the transcript which they had to revise. L<sup>2</sup> availed himself of a text like that of the Extract MSS (ACXDMO), L<sup>3</sup> of what has been called the 'doctored' text of Nonius, the text exhibited in the Wolfenbüttel Codex (V) and used by the correctors of a large number of other MSS (H<sup>2</sup> throughout, E<sup>2</sup> in IV-XX, Cant.<sup>2</sup>, etc.).

The original of the Extract MSS had adapted Nonius to use as a Latin dictionary for the monastery-library, and so had provided explanations of some words which Nonius left unexplained. These additions, peculiar to the Extract MSS, are inserted in L by L<sup>2</sup>; e. g.

167. 20 Reda [vehiculum]

167. 22 Recentiorum [novorum].

In 177. 17 *Sportas*, which stood without addition in the archetype, as attested by F<sup>3</sup>VL<sup>1</sup>, has in the Extract MSS an etymology attached: *Sportas*, aut ab spartu quasi sparteas aut ab sportando. This is added in L by L<sup>2</sup>.

In 439 M. lines 18-28 *decreverint* were omitted, owing to the homoeoteleuton, by L<sup>1</sup>. The corrector (L<sup>2</sup>) has supplied only so much of the missing passage as is found in the Extract MSS, viz. 22 *Simulare*—28 *decreverint*. Other examples of the relation between L<sup>2</sup> and the Extract MSS are:

456. 30 vivoque] uiuoquae L<sup>1</sup> : uiuo L<sup>2</sup> (with the Extract MSS)

461. 29 amnis] amnis L<sup>1</sup>V, etc. : animis L<sup>2</sup> (with the Extract MSS and H<sup>1</sup>PE).

The 'doctored' text of Nonius is probably the work of some Carolingian abbot who tried to provide a readable version, altering our archetype sometimes rightly, more often wrongly, but rarely reproducing the 'ipsae litterae' of its unintelligible parts. Most of the peculiarities of this text are mere conjectures, but some are clerical errors, and a few are the result of more faithful transcription of the archetype.

In 162 M. 15 the true reading is *libro I* (so F<sup>3</sup>), but the reading of the 'doctored' text of Nonius, as represented by the Wolfenbüttel MS (V), was *libro XI*. L<sup>1</sup> has merely *libro*, L<sup>3</sup> has changed this to *libro XI*.

In 256 M. 1 *iunioem* was omitted in the archetype, as is shewn by the consensus of L<sup>1</sup> and the Geneva MS. It is omitted also in the Extract MSS (DMO). But it was inserted in the 'doctored' text (through conjecture, apparently, for the title of Cicero's book of correspondence "ad Caesarem iunioem" is very often mentioned). L<sup>3</sup> has inserted the word.

In 233 M. 19 the words *iracundiam vel furorem* had been miswritten in the archetype *iracundum vel furorem* (possibly *furorum*, as the word is written by L<sup>1</sup>). The Extract MSS rightly changed *iracundum* to *iracundiam*, the 'doctored' text changed *furorem* to *furiosum*. L<sup>1</sup> has *iracundum vel furorum*, L<sup>3</sup> corrects *iracundum vel furiosum*. Other examples are:

248. 7 *alescit*] *alescit* L<sup>1</sup>Gen., etc. : *adolesc* L<sup>3</sup>V, etc.

293. 49 *exacuta*] *exacuta* L<sup>1</sup>Gen., etc. : *ex hac vita* VH<sup>2</sup> : *ex ac vita* L<sup>3</sup>.

The combination, therefore, of L<sup>2</sup> with ACXDMO or of L<sup>3</sup> with VH<sup>2</sup> adds nothing of corroboration to a reading. Rather L<sup>2</sup> should be included with ACXDMO as a group whose combined evidence gives us the reading of one original; and L<sup>3</sup> similarly should be reckoned with VH<sup>2</sup> and (in parts) E<sup>2</sup>Cant.<sup>2</sup> as evidence for the original 'doctored' text.

That these correctors did not also use the actual original of which L is a copy can neither be proved nor disproved. L<sup>2</sup> certainly emends and supplies omissions in parts not included in the Extract MSS; but, on the other hand, these Extract MSS may quite well have come from an original which exhibited a complete text. Indeed, there is a curious feature of our MS which suggests this.

From book VIII (fol. 221 v.) onwards the practice is followed of separating the definition from the examples by suprascript symbols. These marks have been erased as far as fol. 233 v., but they are clearly seen in the subsequent pages. Now, this is the peculiarity of the Extract MSS, that, for the purpose of adapting the work of Nonius to dictionary-form, the explanation of the word is reproduced, while the examples are wholly (or mostly) omitted. In one group of MSS of this family DMO this practice of curtailment is maintained throughout, although at places (notably in the first half of book VI, where the whole text is given) the curtailment is reduced to a minimum. In the other group the whole text is presented from book VI to the end (also

at the opening of book I). If the common original was marked in some way like the Leyden MS, we can well understand how the two divergent groups arose. We thus obtain from our MS a valuable hint for the history of the transmission of the text of our author.

Another point in which L throws light on the nature of the original MS is the treatment of the lemmas, the method of indicating that a new word was subject of discussion in a new paragraph. If these head-words had been indicated by initials (rubricated or not) in the original, we can hardly imagine a calligraphic copy like L ignoring this treatment. But it is not till fol. 15 r. in L that the use of rubricated initials begins. In the earlier pages a horizontal stroke is drawn above the lemma-word by the corrector, e. g. fol. 5 r., above *Inlicere* 6 M. 15. Traces of the (at least occasional) absence of indication of the lemma in the archetype are seen in corruptions, shared by all MSS of Nonius, like *cintinnire* for *tintinnire* 40 M. 12, *tibicidas* for *cibicidas* 88 M. 8, for it is in their minuscule, not their majuscule or initial, form that the letters *c* and *t* are liable to confusion. There is one miswriting of a lemma which points to majuscule script—the corruption *gladatores* for *glaratores* (*gralatores* ‘walkers on stilts’), 115 M. 18, with D for R. It may date from some proto-archetype whose whole text was in majuscules.<sup>1</sup>

The omission of lemmas in the Extract MSS is often due to the absence of an explanation of the word treated, e. g. *adsestrix* 73 M. 29, although sometimes, as we have seen, the compiler of the original of the Extract-group has added an explanation of his own; e. g. 167. 20 Reda [vehiculum]. But undoubtedly another cause lay in the absence in the archetype of any indication of the new lemma. Thus 33 M. 10 *Pedetentim* has a small *p* and no indication of a new paragraph in L<sup>1</sup>, and presumably this indication was lacking also in the archetype. The lemma is passed over in the Extract MSS.

(On traces in L of the use in the archetype of *c* or *caput* to indicate a new paragraph see Philologus, LV 167.)

Some peculiarities of the spelling of the archetype which are revealed to us by L<sup>1</sup> (and Gen.<sup>1</sup>) have been already mentioned, such as the use of *e* for *y*. This barbarism is the cause of the erroneous reading *rex* for *Eryx* in 302 M. 33, where L<sup>1</sup> has *erex*,

<sup>1</sup> The form *glaratores* may be the form of the word actually used by Nonius, a popular form like *Phyrgio* for *Phrygio*, etc.

and was probably already corrected in the archetype in 237 M. 8, where the *quid dante tyranno* of our MSS, instead of *quiddam tyranno*, seems due to a suprascript correction, <sup>ty</sup>*teranno*. The late Latin use of *ui* for *y*, from which our name for the letter is derived, we have already found in the archetype. It has led to the corruption *virum* for *gyrum* in 252. 18, where L<sup>1</sup> reproduces the spelling of the archetype, *guirum*.

That the script of the archetype was minuscule we see from the confusion of letters like *cl* and *d* (e. g. 361. 6 hercle] haec de L<sup>1</sup>, herde Gen.<sup>1</sup>), *a* and *u* (e. g. *maliorum* L<sup>1</sup> for *mulierum*).

We may safely assign to the archetype some peculiar contractions, which are reproduced by L<sup>1</sup> and Gen.<sup>1</sup> (e. g. *supl* with horizontal line above for *suppliciis* in references to Cicero's Verrine oration *de suppliciis*, e. g. 271 M. 25), or of which we find clear trace in these transcripts. For example, the curious reading of L<sup>1</sup>, *sati* for *senati*, 130 M. 10, which the corrector 'corrects' to *satis*, suggests that in the archetype the unusual contraction *s* with horizontal stroke above was used for *sen*, just as *m* with horizontal stroke above is the common contraction of *men*. And this suggestion is supported by the corruption in our MSS at 312 M. 38 *sensu iacerent*] *sed subiacerent* H<sup>1</sup>, *subiacerent* LVH<sup>2</sup>. Similarly *ostari* for *ostentari* in our MSS at 539 M. 2 may be due to a like contraction of the syllable *ten*. In 269 M. 35 *consentire* appears in certain MSS as *consistere*; in 392 M. 29 *evenit* appears as *evit*. In an article in *Philologus*, already referred to, I have mentioned some other contractions which may with more or less probability be ascribed to the archetype (LV 168).

I will conclude this paper by pointing out a possible feature of the archetype of which we seem to find traces in L: I mean the indication of a word by its initial letter or its first syllable merely, in cases of repetition. At 353 M. 5 sqq. we have the verb *niti* exhibited in its various meanings: *niti est conari* . . . *niti, fultum esse*, etc. At the second occurrence of *niti* we find merely *ni* in Gen.<sup>1</sup>, while the verb is omitted by L<sup>1</sup>. At 162 M. 1 we have the lemma *Permittere*, with two examples of the verb from Sisenna. In the second example: *multi praemissis armis ex summo se permitterent*, we find *perm* representing *permitterent* in L. Again at 93 M. 24 (lemma *Continuari*) L omits the verb *continuatur* in the example from Sisenna, I fancy, because *c* stood for *continuatur* in the archetype. In this way I would explain the corruption at 66 M. 4 *Excordes concordesve* (vae L<sup>1</sup>) *ex corde*, where the

example from Cicero includes *vecordes* (vaecordes L) as well as *excordes* and *concordes*. The archetype had: *excordes concordēs vae* (i. e. *vaecordes*). Similarly at 175. 25 sqq. the words, *Subsivum positum succedens succidaneum*, had been misinterpreted as *Subsivum, positum. Succedens, succidaneum*. In the appended example from Cicero *subsivis*, written, presumably, *s.* or *su.* in the archetype, has become *succedens* in our MSS. The omission of *sumet* in the Lucilius example in the lemma *Sumere* 395. 31 sqq. may be accounted for in like fashion. If this brief indication of a repeated word was really a feature of the archetype, light is thrown on the corrupt readings of our MSS in 167. 6 and 229. 13. At 408. 37, where *tangere* (with Acc. of person, Abl. of thing) in the sense of *circumvenire* 'to cheat' is illustrated by an iambic trimeter passage of Turpilus (129 Ribb.):

hoc quaero; ignoscere  
istic solentne eas minoris noxias,  
†erum si forte quasi alias res vini cauo†,

the verb *tangere* does not appear in the example. Editors have found a place for it by changing *cavo* to *tango*, although this second aorist form of *tango* is certain only in the subjunctive mood (*ne attigas, attigat*, etc.).

It may be that the omission of the verb is due to its having been represented in the archetype by its initial letter merely, in which case *cavo* may be regarded as a corruption of *cado*. The true reading may be

erum si forte, quasi alias, vini cado  
tangam,

the word *res* being a gloss on *alias*, which, however, is really the adverb, 'on other occasions.'

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

W. M. LINDSAY.

### III.—THE ΙΕΡΕΙΑΙ OF HELLANICUS AND THE BURNING OF THE ARGIVE HERAEUM.<sup>1</sup>

The testimony of Pamphila in Aulus Gellius, XV 23, to the relative ages of Hellanicus, Herodotus, and Thucydides, even though based on Apollódorus, the pupil of Aristarchus and Panaetius, may be, and probably is, factitious in its exact figures. It may have been a mnemonic device of some helpfulness to have Hellanicus sixty-five, Herodotus fifty-three, and Thucydides forty years of age at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, giving those who stop to reckon the problem out the years 496, 484, and 471 respectively as the natal years of the three great historians; but the mnemonic device must not be made to serve, and probably was never intended to serve, as an exact chronological canon, especially when authentic literary remains of the historians (such, for instance, as those preserved for us in the Scholia on Aristophanes, *Ranae*, 694 and 720) give distinct and clear chronological evidence which is at least difficult, though not impossible, to bring into harmony with the exact figures of the canon. There can be no reasonable doubt that Hellanicus described with considerable detail the events of the year 407/6 B. C., when Antigenes was Archon Eponymous at Athens, and that he did this in his *Atthis*. If we cling to the date 496 as that of his birth, then we must be prepared to allow that he was productive as a historian when past his ninetieth year. This, to be sure, is no more incredible than that Isocrates should finish his *Panathenaicus* in his ninety-seventh year, and is by no means a fatal demand upon

<sup>1</sup> LITERATURE.—Mueller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* I, pp. xxiii-xxxiii, 45-69.

1876: Diels, *Chronologische Untersuchungen über Apollodors Chronika*, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXI, pp. 48-54.

1876: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, in criticism of the above, *Hermes*, XI, pp. 291-4.

1888: Niese, *Die Chronik des Hellanikos*, *Hermes*, XXIII, pp. 81 ff.

1892: Eduard Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, I, pp. 117-21.

1893: Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, pp. 316-26.

1893: Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Aristoteles und Athen*, I, pp. 260-90; II, pp. 19 f.

1893: Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, I<sup>2</sup>, pp. 151 ff.

1895: Wachsmuth, *Alte Geschichte*, pp. 510 f., 555 f.

our credulity. But it is not at all necessary to fix upon the year 496 as the exact year of his birth. The testimony of Pamphila may be not exactly, but generally true; in the words of Aulus Gellius, "Hellanicus, Herodotus, Thucydides, historiae scriptores, in isdem temporibus laude ingenti floruerunt et *non nimis longe distantibus fuerunt aetatibus*."

Grant to Hellanicus, then, a length of days much less than that of Isocrates, and he may have been a slightly older contemporary of Herodotus, a much older contemporary of Thucydides, and may have survived even the latter, as he undoubtedly did the former. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ad Pomp. 3; de Thuc. iud. 5), whom Diels calls "der genaueste Kenner der Logographie," and Plutarch (de mal. Herod. 36; Theseus 26) thought of him as preceding Herodotus; Wilamowitz-Moellendorff insists on ranking him after Herodotus. Both views may be in a measure right. Such a work as the Persica of Hellanicus may well have been composed before Herodotus had published his history; the Atthis of Hellanicus must have been published, at least in its ultimate form, long after the death of Herodotus. Thucydides certainly, and Herodotus probably, drew much material from prior works of Hellanicus, though both looked down upon his methods as far inferior to their own.

The multiplicity of the works of Hellanicus, even after subtitles have been merged as far as possible under main titles, bespeaks a literary career of extraordinary length; so does the great variety in form and method employed by this historian. He never attained the art of throwing mythical and historical material into progressive and climactic epic form, as Herodotus did; or into progressive and climactic dramatic and rhetorical form, as Thucydides did. But it is clear from the fragments of his works now before us that he passed through the horographical, chorographical, and genealogical methods of composing sectional history, up to the method of the general Hellenic chronicle and annal. Beyond the last method, in spite of the brilliant example of Herodotus, he never advanced.

The horographical Lesbiaca naturally precedes and merges into the chorographical Aeolica, and this into the chorographical and genealogical Troica. Of the ten larger works that are with certainty to be attributed to Hellanicus, none is wholly exclusive of the others either in method or material. It is clear that he worked over again much of his material as he passed from one predominating method of composition to another, or

from a complex to a more simple method. Thus, the story of Electra, the daughter of Atlas and mother of Dardanus, is told in the chorographical and genealogical Troica, and also in the purely genealogical Atlantis. So the story of Niobe is told in the genealogical Atlantis, and also in the chronological Hiereiai. The cupbearer whose accidental murder by Heracles caused that hero's banishment from Calydon and brought in its train the final catastrophe on Mount Oeta, is named Cherias in the genealogical Phoronis, but Archias in what Athenaeus (IX, p. 419 F) calls "the histories," probably the Hiereiai, or the Atthis, or both. This is not surprising on the theory of an advance from lower to higher methods of composition.

It is surprising, however, to find that the two great chronological works of Hellanicus, the works most deserving of the name of histories, the Hiereiai and the Atthis, cover much the same ground, and follow the same method. Both chronicles began with a mythical and legendary period, where the chronology was reckoned by generations, an arbitrary unit of forty years; both had next a period covering events from about the time of the Trojan war down through the Persian wars and the *Pentekontaëtie*, where the earlier chronology was reckoned either by generations or by mythical lines of kings; and both, finally, a period covering more or less of the Peloponnesian war, where, as well as in the later parts of the previous period, the chronology was reckoned on the basis of archive lists of public officials. In the case of the Hiereiai, the official was the priestess of Hera at the Argive Heraeum; in that of the Atthis, it was the annual archon at Athens.

While both works included more recent events of the Peloponnesian war, we notice this striking difference between them. The Hiereiai gives us no fragment (i. e. is not cited by later writers) for any event later than the opening years of the war (Frag. 49 = Thuc. I 113 = 447 B. C.; and Frag. 52 = Thuc. II 81, 4 = 429 B. C.), but the Atthis gives us fragments describing much later events, such as the affair of the *Hermæ* at the beginning of the Sicilian expedition (Frag. 78; cf. Thuc. VI 60, 2; Andocides, de myst. 48; Plutarch, Alcibiades, 21) in 415 B. C. and the battle of Arginusæ (Frag. 80) in 406 B. C.

To all appearances, then, on the evidence before us, the Hiereiai was discontinued, and superseded by the Atthis. With due consideration of the great freedom of excursus which Hellanicus, in common with all the "logographers," allowed him-

self, even in his more strictly chorographical works, and also of the increasingly imperial relations of Athens, it is not necessary to assume any more local and narrow scope for the *Atthis* than for the *Hiereiai*. Here we must not be misled by the narrower patriotism of the later antiquarian writers of *Atthides*, like Philochorus above all, with whom Hellanicus is sometimes ranked, much more because he wrote a work which he called '*Atthis*' than because his *Atthis* was like that of Philochorus. When Hellanicus wrote his *Atthis* the Athenians were still making history. The reigning literary spirit was creative and imperialistic, not antiquarian and particularistic. Both the *Hiereiai* and the *Atthis* of Hellanicus were national Hellenic chronicles. Therefore the mystery of their community of form and matter becomes all the deeper, and tempts to explanation.

The catastrophic burning of the Argive Heraeum in November of 423 B. C. furnishes a reasonable explanation. Thucydides describes the disaster with remarkable detail (IV 133, 2, 3): "During the same summer the temple of Hera at Argos was burnt down; Chrysis the priestess had put a light too near the sacred garlands, and had then gone to sleep, so that the whole place took fire and was consumed. In her fear of the people Chrysis fled that very night to Phlius; and the Argives, as the law provided, appointed another priestess named Phaeinis. Chrysis had been priestess during eight years of the war and half of the ninth when she fled." There is no good reason to doubt that Thucydides, when he thus wrote, knew the *Hiereiai* of Hellanicus and had drawn material from it. His words take on added significance if he realized, as he doubtless did, that the chronological basis of a notable rival's history was thus forever and irremediably swept away. There was no immediate prospect, certainly, that it could become imperially current. How Thucydides felt towards this system of chronology which his rival had adopted may, I think, be seen from his words in V 20, 2, where the translation of Jowett is changed slightly, but fairly, as any one would grant: "I would have a person reckon the actual periods of time, and not rely upon lists of archons or other officials whose names may be used in different places to mark the dates of past events. For whether an event occurred in the beginning, or in the middle, or whatever might be the exact point, of these officials' term of office is left uncertain by such a mode of reckoning." And acquaintance, at least, with the system of Hellanicus in the *Hiereiai* may fairly be inferred from the words of Thucy-

dides in II 2, 1, where he attempts to fix the date of the opening of the Peloponnesian war by all the received systems of chronology: "For fourteen years the thirty-years peace which was concluded after the recovery of Euboea remained unbroken. But in the fifteenth year, when Chrysis the high-priestess of Argos was in the forty-eighth year of her priesthood, Ainesias being Ephor at Sparta, and at Athens Pythodorus having two months of his archonship to run, in the sixth month after the engagement at Potidaea, and at the beginning of spring, about the first watch of the night, an armed force of somewhat more than three hundred Thebans entered Plataea, a city of Boeotia, which was an ally of Athens." Here speaks a historian conscious of a method of chronology far superior to that of any rival. The consciousness vents itself in controversy in the passage cited above from book V.

The destruction of the Argive Heraeum certainly made it natural for Hellanicus to abandon the chronological thread for his Hellenic history which had been supplied but could be supplied no longer by the archive lists of temple priestesses. Furthermore, the boundless prestige of Athens during the years between her great triumph over Sparta at Sphacteria (425) and the Peace of Nicias (421) made it equally natural for him to select, as a new chronological thread on which to rearrange the old material of the *Hiereiai* and arrange the new material brought by the advancing years, the archive lists of annual archons at Athens. No basis of chronology bade fair to have more national currency than this.

In the chronological passages already cited from Thucydides we may, on this explanation, see veiled reference to both the *Hiereiai* and the *Atthis* of Hellanicus. The passage which he wrote later, I 97, 2, is more familiar to all: "I have gone out of my way to speak of this period (the *Pentekontaëtie*) because the writers who have preceded me treat either of Hellenic affairs previous to the Persian invasion or of that invasion itself; the intervening portion of history has been omitted by all of them, with the exception of Hellanicus; and he, where he has touched upon it in his Attic history (*ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἐνγγραφῇ*), is very brief, and inaccurate in his chronology." Here the reference is clearly to the *Atthis* alone, which was now recognized as the final form of the great national chronicle. For neither *Atthis* nor *Hiereiai* has Thucydides a kindly word.

B. PERRIN.

#### IV.—MUTARE PULICES.

##### A COMMENT ON LUCILIUS, NON. 351, M.

As far as it is safe to infer from the few single lines now surviving, most of which are due to Nonius, the theme of Lucilius in his twenty-sixth book was not unlike that of the first satire of the second book of Horace. Among other matters, the poet certainly specified the readers whose approbation he most desired, perhaps dilated on the nature of his satire, and, apparently in a dialogue with some acquaintance, explained and defended his reasons for not following the usual public career of a Roman in his position. He also seems to have told why he did not choose to marry and rear a family, duties which, as Marx has shown, had recently been brought home to the Roman citizen by the law of Metellus Macedonicus. A fragment quoted by Nonius (351, M.) to illustrate *mutare* in what he conceived to be the sense of *derelinquere* is generally connected with this discussion.

In the best manuscripts of Nonius, the Berne and Geneva, Xth century; the first hand of the Harleian 2719, IXth century, and the second hand of the Paris 7667, Xth century, a MS copied from the Harleian, the line runs:

Mihi quidem non persuadetur, *pulices* mutem meos.

This text was adopted by Dousa and afterwards, without comment, by Quicherat (edit. of Nonius, 1872, p. 401).

The reading of the Harleian, second hand; of the Paris, first hand; of the Leiden and Wolfenbüttel MSS, and, according to Lachmann's critical note (Lucil. 599), of the Basel edition, is *publices*. Without some emendation, *publices* is, of course, impossible. The Aldine of 1513; H. Junius, Antwerp, 1565, and Lachmann (Lucilius, Berlin, 1876) emend to *publice ut* mutem. Mercier, the first great editor of Nonius, in the Paris edition of 1614, writes *publice* mutem. According to this emendation of the text, *publice* is to be taken in its not unusual sense of 'in the service' or 'on

behalf, of the state,' and with *meos* some word like *amicos* or *familiares* might be either understood or supposed to occur in the following line. We should therefore translate: 'You won't induce me at least to change my friends for the benefit of the state,' and should agree, for example, with Sellar, *Roman Poets of the Republic*, p. 230, that we have here one of the poet's reasons for preferring a private life.

In his edition of Lucilius (1872, XXVI 13) Müller made the very simple emendation to *publicis* (i. e. *publiceis*) mutem, explaining the word (p. 246) by *τελωνία*, and supplying *familiares* with *meos*. This makes the fragment differ slightly in meaning, but it would be used in the same connection as before. If, however, we are to believe Nonius, the difficulty with the text after Müller's emendation is that *mutare* does not mean *derelinquere*, but is used in its ordinary sense. It was apparently for this reason that Müller gave up *publicis* and, in his edition of Nonius, I, p. 568 (1888), wrote *Publi, utei* mutem, just as his vessel of wrath, Francken—neither seems to have ever mentioned the other in this connection—proposed, *Mnemos. XVI* 396, to read *Publie ut* mutem, supporting his form of the vocative by Priscian, 301, K. and supplying *lares* with *meos*. In both cases the connection of thought appears to be about the same as before.

If we except Dousa and Quicherat, there are certainly two objections to all the texts so far mentioned. First, they are emendations, and, speaking in general, these should be the last resort; and second, *publices*, upon which they are all founded and from which successive editors take us farther away, is itself not the reading of the best MSS. It is clear, as Stowasser well observes (*Wiener Stud. V* 262), that "the text-tradition calls for something else." The best MS reading for this flea-bitten line is, without a doubt, *pulices*. But Stowasser thinks that *paelices* was the text of the archetype. Being derived from a single reading (*pullices*, Paris 7667, M<sup>2</sup>), the emendation has the peculiarity of being as easy from the side of palaeography as it is unlikely from all other points of view. Having adopted the word, we must either change *meos* to *meas* or suppose that *paelices* here was exceptionally masculine. Stowasser chooses the second alternative, and supports it by Sueton., *Caes.* 49; Martial, *XII* 97, 3 (96, 3, Fr.), and Festus, 222, M. But these examples do not impress me as having any bearing on the gender of *paelix*. They simply show that the word was sometimes applied to males.

Professor Stowasser then proceeds to associate with his emended fragment XXVI 22, M. and XXVII 28, M.—Arcades ambo—and adds: "Lucilius war ja stark in der *μοῦσα παιδική*."

It was evidently the same train of thought that led Baehrens, FPR. 1886, Lucil. 503, to print *podices*. Francken, l. c., claimed not to understand this emendation, but *podices* can hardly fail to be clear enough to a more worldly mind.<sup>1</sup> Surely neither the great satirist nor his text deserves such revision as this.

As we review this long discussion it is interesting to observe how completely every one seems to have forgotten that perhaps the best text, just as it stands, may mean something. While Dousa and Quicherat adopted *pulices*, each did so without comment.

The only suggestion from this point of view, and it seems to me the best, comes from Birt, *Zwei politische Satiren*, etc., Marburg, 1888, p. 121. He makes this line belong to the speech of some man who is not only dirty but remains so from choice, and reads:

Mihi quidem non persuadetur. Pulices mutem meos?

"Ich soll mich von meinem Ungeziefer trennen? Das redet mir keiner ein!"

Certainly Birt's interpretation has some marked advantages over all the others proposed. The greatest of them are that it preserves the best text unaltered and, at the same time, gives good sense. Moreover, the insertion of a period disposes of the subjunctive without *ut* after *persuadetur*, which, although Sall. Jug. 35, 2, gives one undoubted example, I have not found elsewhere. This interpretation also gives us *mutare* in the sense of *derelinquere*, which, it is true, is in conformity with the lemma of Nonius. But for that very reason, may we not object to the possible truth of Birt's view?

Was *mutare* ever used in the literal sense of 'trennen,' 'part with,' *derelinquere*, as Nonius puts it? Except in his own statement, I have been quite unable to find a shred of testimony for it. It is unfortunate that every other example he may have quoted under this head has been lost, otherwise we might be in a better position to test his view. But while I can not find a single undoubted case in which *mutare* is equivalent to *derelinquere*, it is perhaps worth noting that there are those in which to translate *mutare* by *dere-*

<sup>1</sup> Though Baehrens would hardly have been able to find examples for his figurative use of *podex*.

*linguere* not only gives good sense but, as far as it goes, the right sense. Such a case is Vergil, Aen. 3, 161 *mutandae sedes*, which, as Müller observes in his note to Nonius, l. c., and, as I proved by an examination of Vergil's usage, is the only example that Nonius could have consistently quoted from this author. That he did quote one from him is not certain, but it is rendered probable by the fact that, although the reference itself has dropped out, the name of Vergil, as shown by Müller's text and his critical note, was, in some way, connected with the passage.

Now, without wishing to cast any further aspersion on the memory of a well-meaning old gentleman who has been vilified often enough, and sometimes without cause, by generations of impatient scholars, it is not going too far to say that he would be quite capable of translating Vergil's sentence *mutandae sedes* by *sedes derelinquendae sunt*. This is good sense, and half of the right sense. The other half is something like *et aliae* [*sedes*] *petendae*.

In short, I can not find any example of *mutare* in which the equivalent of the thing changed, i. e. the thing changed for, is not either expressed or implied. If the equivalent is of the same sort, it is regular both in Latin and English not to mention it. Hence the common use of *mutare* 'change' with a direct object alone: *mutare consilium, vestem, solum, testamentum, propositum*, etc., etc., 'to change one's plans,' sc. for plans, i. e. other plans, 'one's clothes,' of course, for other clothes, etc.

Certainly Nonius is hardly strong enough—unless propped with good examples, and in this case he is not—to support one against what seems a universal law of usage. Until, therefore, we have something more than his own statement supported—as far as we are concerned—by a single example which, it is more than likely, he did not understand and had never seen in its original setting, I see no reason why we should not include the fragment before us in a category which ought to apply to the whole language. Let us translate *mutare pulices meos* as we translate *mutare vestem, consilium*, and every other case in which the thing for which the change is made, being of the same sort as the thing changed, is not expressed. By so doing we have:

Mihi quidem non persuadetur pulices mutem meos:

'You won't induce me, anyhow, to change my fleas' (that is, of course, 'for other fleas').

Does any one at all familiar with the temperament of the flea, especially one whose memory is still vivid of the first few nights he spent in an Italian hotel, fail to perceive what is meant here by the metaphor of 'changing fleas'? If so, let me, by way of a brief excursus in Natural History, remind him and all those who have never sojourned in a flea-bitten latitude that the *Pulex Irritans* has a marked fondness for strangers. New blood rouses him to what, even for him, is supernatural activity. If one changes his fleas—and in Italy this seems to be the only difference in one's relations with them that he can hope to bring about—one is certain to be worse off, because, for the time being, he is the palatable stranger. This fact is not only perfectly well known, but has doubtless been known ever since the prehistoric beginning of this association between the eater and the eaten.

In other words, *mutare pulices* is a vulgar but expressive metaphor characteristic of both Lucilius and his department, and corresponds to our proverbial "out of the frying-pan into the fire."

Thus interpreted, the general import of the fragment is perfectly clear, although it is not certain who was the speaker, nor in which of several quite possible connections the remark was made. One is tempted, however, to suggest the time-honored theme of marriage *versus* single-blessedness which we know to have been discussed in this book. If so, let us suppose, by way of illustration, that the *dramatis personae* here were Lucilius and some friend, perhaps a married man, or, at least, an admirer of the new law, who has been trying to convert the poet by descanting at large on the disadvantages of his single life. Could we have an answer more pointed and, at the same time, more characteristic of the confirmed old bachelor Lucilius than

Mihi quidem non persuadetur pulices mutem meos?

The import of the expression *pulices mutare* is not disturbed by the fact that the illustration just given is only one from a number of possible situations.

We may be sure, of course, that Lucilius was not the first to use a metaphor suggested by pests that both in Greece and Italy

Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona  
multi.

The character of the phrase, which is clearly popular, gives one good reason to suspect that it may be the proverbial short-hand statement of some old story belonging, by preference, to the realm

of the fable. Such a fable, attributed, in so many words, to Aesop, is found in Aristotle, *Rhet.* II 20, 6 f. (Halm, 36). Apropos of the use which the orator may make of the fable as a παράδειγμα or illustration, Aristotle quotes two as examples; first the famous fable which Stesichoros applied to Phalaris, and, second, the following:

"A popular leader at Samos was being tried for his life. Aesop, in the course of a speech to the people, said:

'Once on a time, a Fox, while fording a Stream, was swept away into a Gorge. Not being able to get out, she was for a long time in a sorry plight, and Dog-ticks in great numbers fastened upon her. Finally, a Hedgehog, while wandering about, saw her and, taking pity, asked whether he should not get the Ticks off. But she said "No," and being asked why, replied: "These are now full of me and draw but little blood. If you drive them off, Others will come, who are famished, and drink out of me what blood there is left." And so in your case, men of Samos, this man will do no further injury—he is rich—but if you put this one to death, others will come who are poor. They will steal what you have left.'"<sup>1</sup>

For our purpose, the literary *milieu* of this Aesopic fable is interesting and significant. If the fable of the Fox and Dog-ticks was established in the rhetorical tradition as early as Aristotle and sanctioned by so great an authority, we may be tolerably certain that it remained there, and was familiar to many generations of boys as a stock example. In fact, Plutarch, 790 C (*An Senigerenda* etc.) does quote a portion of it, though, perhaps, directly from Aristotle. Certainly, the following passage from Josephus,

<sup>1</sup> It was undoubtedly from this passage that Vanbrugh drew the following scene (*Aesop*, act II, vol. I, p. 200, Ward). Two tradesmen of Samos are petitioning Aesop for a new governor:

"*Aesop*. Why, what's the matter with your old one?

*2d Tra*. What's the matter? Why, he grows rich; that's the matter; and he that's rich can't be innocent; that's all.

*Aesop*. Does he use any of you harshly? or punish you without a fault?

*2d Tra*. No, but he grows as rich as a miser; his purse is so crammed, it's ready to burst again.

*Aesop*. When 'tis full 'twill hold no more. A new governor will have an empty one.

*2d Tra*. 'Fore Gad, neighbour, the little gentleman's in the right on't!

*1st Tra*. Why, truly I don't know but he may. For now it comes in my head, it cost me more money to fat my hog, than to keep him fat when he was so. Prithee, tell him we'll e'en keep our old governor."

Arch. 18, 6, 5, the reference to which I owe to Professor Warren, has every appearance of being a garbled version of it. The passage is one referring to the well-known provincial policy of Tiberius, which, in fact, was quite in line with the method recommended by Aesop. After telling why he never "turned the rascals out," the emperor, "by way of illustration, told this story:

'A certain man was lying sorely hurt and the flies gathered about his wounds in swarms. Somebody who happened upon him, pitying his evil case and thinking that he could not help himself, stood by and had nearly succeeded in scaring them off, when the man begged of him to stop. When asked why he was so indifferent about escaping from the pest he replied: 'Why, you would do me great harm by driving these flies away. They are already full of blood and no longer so eager to trouble me; indeed, they even hold up now and then. But the others are fresh and hungry—if they fastened on me, exhausted as I am already, they would soon make an end of me.'"

Unless we count our Lucilian fragment, I find no other trace of this fable in Latin. But this does not prove that there was none. In fact, it is not impossible that this very line is a fragment of the fable itself. We know that Lucilius, like Ennius and Horace, told fables, and that they were characteristic of satire. The principal objection to the theory that Lucilius was actually retelling the Aesopic fable, as related by Aristotle, or that his *mutare pulices* was drawn directly from it, is the fact that the Latin equivalent given for Aesop's dog-tick, *κυνοπαῖστής*, is *ricinus*, not *pulex*. But it is perhaps worth noting that in the Italian version of Aesop's fable, to which Dr. Shaw has called my attention, the word employed for *κυνοπαῖστής*, although *ricino* is still found in the lexicons, is the regular modern Italian *pulci* (*pulices*), and such may have been the popular usage even in Lucilius' time, just as in the ordinary speech of this country dogs have 'fleas.' 'Dog-ticks' infest only the Latin and Greek lexicons.

But whether Lucilius' expression in this line is a metaphor drawn from the simple observation of ordinary life, whether it is derived from an old fable, or whether it is actually a portion of that old fable, is not a question of vital importance, since in all those cases the point, so far as interpretation is concerned, is the same. It is the flea himself who tells us in no uncertain terms that *pulices mutare* is the equivalent of our popular phrase: "Out of the frying-pan into the fire."

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

## V.—THE PARENTAGE OF JUVENAL.

The ancient biography appended to the Montpellier manuscript of Juvenal contains in its opening sentence an interesting and, if worthy of belief, not unimportant reference to the poet's father: Iunius Iuvenalis, libertini locupletis incertum filius an alumnus, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepararet.<sup>1</sup> The statements here made, though ignored or rejected by some writers on Juvenal,<sup>2</sup> have been repeated again and again without qualification as unquestionable facts.<sup>3</sup> In the biography of a later period, discov-

<sup>1</sup> J. Dürr, *Das Leben Juvenals*, Ulm, 1888, S. 22, Vita I a.

Cf. I b: Iunius Iuvenalis, libertini locupletis incertum filius an alumnus, ex Aquinio Volscorum oppido oriundus temporibus Claudii Neronis, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepararet;

II a: Iunius Iuvenalis Aquinas id est de Aquino oppido oriundus et natus, qui ad mediam fere aetatem satirice declamavit . . .;

II c: Iuvenalis fuit Aquinas id est de Aquino oppido. Incertum est, an fuerit filius liberti locupletis an alumnus;

III a, b: Prima aetate siluit, ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit;

III c: Prima aetate tacuit, media vero declamavit temporibus Claudii Neronis imperatoris;

IV: . . . ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit;

V: M. Iunius Iuvenalis ex municipio Aquinati, ordinis ut fertur libertinorum, Romae literis operam dedit. Declamavit non mediocri fama, ut ipse scribit: "et nos consilium dedimus Syllae."

<sup>2</sup> Weidner, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*, 2. Aufl., Leipzig, 1889, S. x; Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, 2. Theil, München, 1892, S. 337 ff.; Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, Bd. III, Stuttgart, 1892, S. 294.

<sup>3</sup> C. F. Hermann, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirarum Libri Quinque*, Lipsiae, 1854 (Ed. Teub. 1883, p. viii); C. Synnerberg, *De Temporibus Vitae Carminumque D. Iunii Iuvenalis Rite Constituendis*, Helsingforsiae, 1866, p. 53 sq.; E. Strube, *De Rhetorica Iuvenalis Disciplina*, Brandenburg a. d. H., 1875, p. 1; D. Naguiewski, *De Iuvenalis Vita Observationes*, Rigae, 1883, p. 65; Dürr, l. c., S. 11 f.; H. Nettleship, *Lectures and Essays*, second series, Oxford, 1895, p. 139; E. Hübner, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1889, No. 49, Sp. 1342; H. J. de Dompierre de Chaufepié, *De Titulo I. R. N. 4312 ad Iuvenalem Poetam Perperam Relato*, Hagae Comitum, 1889, p. 15; R. Y. Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry*, Boston and New York, 1895, p. 237; L. Friedlaender, *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturarum Libri V*, Leipzig, 1895, Bd. I, S. 4.

ered and published within recent years by Dürr from a manuscript in the library of the Palazzo Barberini at Rome, while no allusion is made, as in the other memoirs, to the social condition of Juvenal's father, both parents as well as a sister are mentioned by name, Aquinum being designated as their native place: Iunius Iuvenalis Aquinas Iunio Iuvenale patre, matre vero Septumeleia ex Aquinati municipio Claudio Nerone et L. Antistio consulibus natus est. Sororem habuit Septumeleiam, quae Fuscino nupsit.<sup>1</sup> The judgment of Dürr, who accepts these explicit details as a remnant of genuine old tradition, has met with approval<sup>2</sup> and with dissent<sup>3</sup> on the part of eminent Juvenalian scholars. In no case, however, has the parentage of the satirist been made the subject of thorough investigation. A reexamination, accordingly, of the sources of our information concerning the poet's origin recommends itself as having an important bearing not only on our attitude toward the numerous biographies of Juvenal, the real character of which, in spite of the discussions of a century, is still in question, but also to some extent on our estimate of the poet himself.

The age and authorship of the first twelve biographies of Dürr's collection (the younger biography will be considered separately) have not been and perhaps never can be definitely determined. But whether the original life was composed at the same time as the oldest of the scholia and by the same author, or was an earlier or later production than that commentary; whether one of the lives is the basis of all the rest or was derived, together with the others or a part of them, from a still more ancient life which has not been preserved; what relation exists between these sketches and the supposed allusion of Sidonius Apollinaris to the banishment of Juvenal, and other similar questions, it is not necessary for our present purpose to decide. It can be shown more satisfactorily in other ways how much trustworthiness the memoirs have.

If at the outset we undertake to remove from them what could easily be inferred from the Satires, what is in conflict with known facts of history, what is made incredible by mutual contradiction, and what must be condemned on the ground of inherent improbability, even conservative criticism will permit the retention of but

<sup>1</sup> Dürr, S. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Hübner, l. c., Sp. 1341; Schanz, l. c., S. 339.

<sup>3</sup> Friedlaender, S. 15.

a fragment. Thus the various and conflicting accounts of the place to which the poet was banished destroy each other; the circumstance assigned as the cause of his banishment has been shown to be a myth,<sup>1</sup> so that no foundation is left for belief in the banishment at all<sup>2</sup>; what is said of the manner in which he made his first appearance as a satirist is an inseparable part of the same legend; and the statement regarding his age is a possible inference from his own words.<sup>3</sup>

And yet it is a commonly cherished belief that imbedded in this rubbish is a nucleus of truth handed down from the time of Juvenal independently of his poems. The rejection, however, of manifestly worthless elements brings into view as the only tangible support of such a belief the statements concerning Juvenal's parentage and practice of declamation. With these statements the theory of the kernel of truth must stand or fall.

A criterion for dealing with the residue in question is not difficult to find. The demonstrated character of all other matter in the biographies obviously demands that we accept no part as derived from reliable tradition unless it is something intrinsically probable which could not have been suggested by what Juvenal himself says and for the arbitrary fabrication of which no reason can be seen.<sup>4</sup> This, however, is not enough. We are bound to reject, not perhaps everything that lacks express corroboration in the Satires, but, at all events, whatever is not in complete harmony with the evidence which they contain.

Junius Juvenal, as the memoir runs, the son or foster son, it is uncertain which, of a rich freedman, declaimed till middle life for pleasure rather than because he was preparing himself for school or forum. The two thoughts of the sentence are logically as well as grammatically connected. It was his father's wealth that enabled him to devote so much time to rhetorical study merely to satisfy his bent. His circumstances were such that he was not obliged to look forward to the serious business of teaching or practising law. The implied relation between the two statements is intimate, and our confidence in the first will be confirmed or shaken by our judgment of the second.

<sup>1</sup> J. Vahlen, 'Juvenal und Paris,' *Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Akademie*, 1883, S. 1175 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Hübner, l. c., No. 50, Sp. 1374 ff.; Schanz, S. 339 f.

<sup>3</sup> Vahlen, l. c., S. 1190.

<sup>4</sup> Schanz, S. 339; Friedlaender, S. 4.

It is customary to point to the pronounced rhetorical character of much that Juvenal has written as proof of his long practice of declamation. The disposition of the subject-matter, the connection of the parts, the lack of unity, the commonplaces and examples, the abrupt digressions, the fullness of expression, the figures of speech, the strong colors, and other features of the Satires are passed in review and explained as the work of a poetical declaimer, a rhetorician from top to toe, whose writings show throughout that the ways and habits of the schools of rhetoric had become to him a second nature. The statement, to be sure, of Juvenal himself, that he attended a school of rhetoric (1, 15 sqq.), is abundantly corroborated. But what Juvenal says and what we read in the biography are widely different things. Assuming the correctness of the latter, we seek in vain a natural and satisfactory explanation of certain facts.

In depicting the inadequate remuneration of lawyers (7, 106 sqq.) he says that Aemilius, who lives in the pomp of wealth, will receive as large a fee as the law allows, and adds: *et melius nos egimus*. The pronoun, which the commentators leave unnoticed, should be understood of Juvenal alone, as in the similar allusion to his education (1, 15 sqq.):

*et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos  
consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum  
dormiret.*

If it is taken in a broader sense, it must at the farthest be referred to a class to which Juvenal had belonged. That he was no longer a member of it is implied in the tone of the whole passage, and especially of the conclusion, in which he bids those who expect pay for their eloquence to betake themselves to Gaul or to Africa. He was, then, at one time an advocate of slender means. It was not as an outsider that he became so thoroughly acquainted with all the trials of a poor lawyer. It was the eloquent but struggling pleader of causes, not a poet or rhetorician, whom Martial described as anxiously visiting in his sweaty toga the palaces of the rich (12, 18) and to whom he applied that much vexed epithet *facundus* (7, 91), a term which Juvenal also uses of lawyers, with allusion, perhaps, to himself:

8, 48

*tamen ima plebe Quiritem  
facundum invenies, solet hic defendere causas  
nobilis indocti;*

7, 145

*rara in tenui facundia panno,*

designating, at any rate, a quality which he was conscious of possessing (*et melius nos egimus*). From the Epigrams in which Juvenal is mentioned by Martial, published about 91 A. D. and 100 A. D., it appears, in the light of what has been said, that Juvenal was a lawyer all the last decade of the first century and probably before that time—at least a decade before the publication of the first book of the *Satires*, with its allusion to an event of 100 A. D. (1, 47 sqq.). Of his straitened circumstances in this part of his career—it was subsequent acquisitions of one kind or another that brought him enough to make him comfortable and contented in later years—still other indications are not wanting. In describing the scenes connected with the distribution of the *sportula* (1, 99 sqq.) he may possibly not imply that he is himself a recipient of the favor,<sup>1</sup> yet he certainly does place himself in the same class with the poor people who must stand back till the rich are served. That Juvenal was poor has often been pointed out<sup>2</sup> on the basis of indirect evidence, which, indecisive by itself, is nevertheless strongly corroborative. His deep sympathy for the poor, to whom he devotes so much attention in the earlier *Satires*, and his full knowledge of their troubles are best understood as an outgrowth of his experience. He had himself suffered the ills from which he drew his philosophy of life (13, 20):

ducimus autem  
hos quoque felices, qui ferre incommoda vitae  
nec iactare iugum vita didicere magistra.

It is in the earliest *Satires* that Juvenal's touch with life is closest. He introduces himself at once as a keen and intensely interested observer of all that is going on in the great city. And he is not a mere looker-on, himself untouched. This man, whose first greeting to us is an outburst of indignation over what he sees, must have been for no inconsiderable time personally affected in some serious way by the life which he describes. In the earliest *Satires*, too, as every reader of Juvenal has noticed, the faulty rhetorical element, of which so much is wont to be made, is less conspicuous and offensive than elsewhere. The great difference between this part of his work and most of his later productions has found various explanations. We can not, indeed, but feel to some extent with the acute amputator of the

<sup>1</sup> Friedlaender, S. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Nettleship, p. 144; De Dompiere de Chaufepié, p. 27 sqq.; Friedlaender, S. 19.

poet, that we possess the writings of two Juvenals. That he tried at first to produce real works of art, but finally abandoned the futile effort and consciously surrendered himself to rhetorical mannerism,<sup>1</sup> and that his fire was but the blaze of rhetoric, and, being artificial, soon died down,<sup>2</sup> are views resting on the hypothesis that he was nothing but a rhetorician. From his change of manner may be drawn at least one certain conclusion: that in writing the first *Satires* he was decidedly less under the influence of the schools of rhetoric than later.

We have now, it is clear, the elements of a picture with which the Juvenal of the biography does not harmonize. The man who, in taking up his pen to castigate the vices of his time, came to his task with full knowledge gained by long personal contact with the world, who for ten years or more had been an advocate competent but handicapped by poverty, who as he assumed his new rôle had only a slur for the declamation of the schools and was far less under their universal influence than afterwards, when he had given vent to his wrath and accomplished, in the main, his original purpose—was not a gentleman of leisure, well-to-do and aimless, declaiming till middle life for self-gratification, and then turning directly from artificial themes and thoughts to the successful cultivation of satire. Beyond the simple fact stated by Juvenal himself, that he once practised declamation, there is not one word of truth in the statement of the biography: *ad mediam fere aetatem declamavit animi magis causa quam quod scholae se aut foro praepareret*.

A false notion of the rhetorical studies of Juvenal, due largely to the fictions of the biography, has led to an equally false judgment of his character, a judgment vitally connected with the subject under consideration. It is not strange that the indignation of a purposeless declaimer should be regarded as more or less artificial, that he should be suspected of insincerity, and that his plainness of speech, measured by the standards of a different age, should be taken as a sign of prurience. When, however, we recognize in Juvenal the lawyer who had studied, it is true, in the schools of rhetoric, but for the purpose of fitting himself for active life, and who, in following his chosen calling, had battled with untoward circumstances and unjust conditions, what he says has quite a different force. We hear him speak in the manner in

<sup>1</sup> Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken*, Leipzig, 1889, S. 547.

<sup>2</sup> Schanz, S. 344 f.

which we should expect an advocate-poet to speak. We feel the genuineness of his indignation whether he is dealing with the present or with the past. We see before us a man who, in the spirit of an advocate, gives us one side of a picture, but whose sincerity and honesty we have no reason whatever to impugn.

Having cleared the way by our discussion of the account of Juvenal's rhetorical studies, we may approach the associated question of his relationship to a rich freedman. On the threshold of our inquiry attention is arrested by the form of statement employed in the memoir. The biographer admits that he is uncertain whether Juvenal was the man's son or foster son. It has been thought<sup>1</sup> that this admission points to a conscientious spirit on the part of the writer. The inference is charitable rather than plausible. We wonder why all traces of this remarkable scrupulosity are so conspicuously absent from the rest of the memoir, judging from which we have much greater reason to infer a wavering between two conjectures and lack of all definite information on the subject.

But dependence is not to be placed in divination. As before, it is only by recourse to the Satires that we can get solid ground beneath our feet. Fortunately, Juvenal has not left us in the dark concerning his sentiments toward rich freedmen. He has made this the most prominent type in his sketch of the company accustomed to gather at the rich man's door to receive the sportula. The patron bids his crier summon first the nobles, but a freedman blocks the way (1, 99 sqq.):

iubet a praecone vocari  
 ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi  
 nobiscum. 'da praetori, da deinde tribuno.'  
 sed libertinus prior est. 'prior' inquit 'ego adsum.  
 cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis  
 natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestrae  
 arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae  
 quadringenta parant. quid confert purpura maior  
 optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro  
 conductas Corvinus oves, ego possideo plus  
 Pallante et Licinis?' expectent ergo tribuni,  
 vincant divitiae, sacro ne cedat honori  
 nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis,  
 quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum  
 maiestas, etsi funesta pecunia templo  
 nondum habitat, nullas nummorum ereximus aras.

<sup>1</sup> Dürr, S. 11.

Here Juvenal has taken pains, at the expense of symmetry and unity, to indicate by a detailed description his aversion for a class brought to the front by the power of wealth. That citizens of noble stock, that magistrates holding sacred office in the Roman state should be compelled to yield precedence to such persons offends him. And it is the class as such that he has in mind. He does not by a word assail the character of the freedman. Nor can we doubt his sincerity. He is not elaborating a theme of the schools, but introducing himself to the public in his first book, in which, if anywhere, he speaks from the heart.

What is set forth in a general way in the passage quoted is illustrated by particular instances. If there was a man in all the world whom Juvenal hated, it was Crispinus the rich freedman. And he hated him as a freedman. He does not mention him without reference to his Egyptian origin (1, 26 sq.; 4, 32 sq.). It is also not improbable that the rich upstart (1, 3; 10, 226), once his barber, and the gladiators and criers, whose very sons excited his displeasure (3, 153 sqq.), are to be referred to the same class. His hostility to the rich, whoever they were, is a matter of common observation.<sup>1</sup>

A clear conception of the fixed sentiments of a man like Juvenal furnishes a basis for criticism. Conceding to him, as we have, sincerity and honesty, we must also regard him as a man of honor and justice, who had Roman ideas with respect to social distinctions, but hated hypocrites (Sat. 2), and believed in a proper return for services rendered and favors received (Sat. 7). If, now, as we are told in the memoir, he was the son of a rich freedman, or the foster son, in which case he may have been a freedman himself,<sup>2</sup> we encounter the startling anomaly, that he looked with especial aversion upon the very class from which he sprang, or to which he belonged, and to a member of which he owed his education and, in the view of the biographer, easy circumstances for half his life. This can not be attributed to Juvenal. It will not suffice to say that he was ashamed of his birth and tried to conceal it. That might be true of a snob. But Juvenal has none of the characteristics of a snob. It is not permissible to cite as parallel the case of Horace, the son of a freedman, who makes a fierce attack upon a freedman (Epode 4). Horace has in mind a particular individual personally detestable (v. 11 sqq.). He nowhere attacks freedmen as a class. Nor can

<sup>1</sup> Friedlaender, S. 20 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Dürr, S. 12.

we entertain the view that Juvenal was the son or adopted son of a rich freedman, but, not having been provided for by his father,<sup>1</sup> had on that account reason for hating him and all freedmen. The fact that he received from his father an inheritance (6, 57) makes such a supposition anything but probable.

We have found what we should have been surprised not to find in a statement that is part and parcel of the story about the poet's declamation. We should have been still further surprised to have gained the conviction that Juvenal's father, a freedman of wealth, contrary to custom (3, 153) and human nature, instead of wishing the man who bore his name to enjoy as high a social position as possible, allowed him to carry on for years, without assistance, a losing fight with poverty, and finally bequeathed to him but an insignificant estate.<sup>2</sup>

But it has been maintained<sup>3</sup> that these statements, which we have rejected, bear the stamp of truth because they could not have been inferred from the Satires and because there is no conceivable reason why they should have been arbitrarily invented. And yet occasion enough for such inference and invention is easily discovered. It appears from the first Satire that Juvenal studied rhetoric in the schools (1, 15 sqq.) and that he had reached middle life at least (1, 25). The biographer, having no information of any military or professional career preceding that of satirist, inferred from this fact, it may be, and in a manner quite in keeping with his way of reasoning as revealed in the rest of the memoir, that Juvenal declaimed till middle life for pleasure. In that case he must have been in easy circumstances. Nothing more was needed to assign to him a rich father. But nothing was known about his father. It would follow, of course, that he was a nobody, perhaps a freedman. Had not Horace the satirist been a freedman's son? Had not the satirist Turnus been a freedman himself (Schol. ad 1, 20)? To be sure, he might just as well have been an adopted son. Between the two possibilities a decision was not made. Exactly this line of thought may not have been followed in detail, but that it was easy enough for the biographer to base his fancies on the subject-matter of the first Satire is manifest.

<sup>1</sup> De Dompierre de Chaufepié, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 6, 57 :

vivat Gabiis, ut vixit in agro,  
vivat Fidenis, et AGELLO cedo paterno.

<sup>3</sup> Friedlaender, S. 4.

The biography of younger date, betraying plainly its character, presents an easier problem. According to this biography the father, as we have seen, was named Junius Juvenal; the mother, Septumeleia. They were from Aquinum, and their son was born in the consulship of Claudius Nero and Lucius Antistius (55 A. D.). Dürr himself admits, what is quite evident, that almost everything in this life is invented or derived from the *Satires*, or taken from other sources and arbitrarily referred to Juvenal, and aptly concludes from the general tone and character of the production that it is the work of some humanist of the fifteenth century.<sup>1</sup> To this extent the matter is not in controversy. The father's name also, it is plain, could have been transferred from that of the son. The name of the mother and sister, however, and the year of birth, it is thought, must have come from an old biography and had their source in good tradition. But first of all, though granting it as a remote possibility, we must nevertheless consider it strange that an old life containing these definite and important particulars should be in existence till the fifteenth century and not be known or used by any of the writers or revisers of the other lives. The chief characteristic of the memoir awakens still further suspicion. It shows clearly the tendency to designate by name all the prominent persons with whom Juvenal was in any way personally connected. In addition to his father, mother, sister, brother-in-law, and the consuls under whom he was born, are mentioned as his teachers or otherwise Probus of Berytus, Marcus Antonius Liberalis, Palaemon, Fronto, Lucius Gallus, and Volusius Bithynicus. That the *Satires*, Jerome, Martial, Macrobius or Gellius,<sup>2</sup> and the other lives furnish the material for these details is evident from the thought and expression. It is clear, too, that the writer, in seeking to connect Juvenal with these men, repeatedly states as a fact what is, as he must have been fully aware, an absolute falsification. Under such circumstances we are justified in surmising that what is said of Juvenal's mother and sister and the year of his birth may be of the same character. Only one thing stands in the way. It is declared that the date of birth harmonizes admirably with all else that we know of Juvenal's life,<sup>3</sup> though this has been denied,<sup>4</sup> and that nothing can be discovered in the *Satires* or elsewhere from which that date could have been inferred or which could have occasioned its adoption. But, in fact, it is not necessary to look far to discover what is

<sup>1</sup> Dürr, S. 29.<sup>2</sup> *Ib.*, S. 30.<sup>3</sup> *Ib.*, S. 30.<sup>4</sup> Friedlaender, S. 15.

amply sufficient to have suggested to the uncritical and unscrupulous author of the memoir those very consuls. The first Satire contains a reference to an event of the year 100 A. D. (1, 49 sq.). When writing that Satire, Juvenal had ceased to be a *iuvēnis* (1, 25). The age of the *iuvēnis* extended, according to Varro,<sup>1</sup> to the forty-fifth year, and, if Juvenal ceased to be a *iuvēnis* in 100 A. D., which was apparently the unwarranted interpretation of the biographer, he was born in 55 A. D., in the consulship of Claudius Nero and Lucius Antistius. We do not know the source of the name Septumeleia. It may have been seen associated in some way with Aquinum. But without ascertaining how the writer came by it, we are compelled, by what we know of everything else in the memoir, to ascribe the use of this name also to combination or falsification.

By our examination, then, of the only parts of the biographies, older or younger, which have any appearance of being based on reliable tradition independent of the Satires, it has been shown that these parts are no more trustworthy than the rest. Nothing but blind credulity remains to support the theory of a kernel of truth. There is, indeed, an old nucleus in the memoirs, but it is a nucleus of old conjecture. The author of the original biography undertook to write a life of Juvenal in imitation, it seems, of Suetonius' lives of the poets. He did it, but his own conjectures and combinations furnished all his material. He had learned nothing at all from genuine tradition.

If we search, as we should, in Juvenal's own words for information concerning his parentage, we shall find again that in his settled views of men and things are plain hints for our guidance. It is involved in the conclusions which we have already reached that he was the son of freeborn parents. His strong antipathy to foreigners, whose presence in the city made it in his eyes well-nigh unbearable (3, 60 sqq.) and whose customs brought in by wealth had undermined the old Roman virtue (6, 298 sqq.), precludes the idea that he and his parents were other than Roman citizens. They did not, however, belong to the aristocracy. Juvenal, in what he says about the sportula (1, 99 sqq.), expressly distinguishes himself from the Roman nobles of old extraction, and in his imaginary conversation with the noble Rubellius (8, 39 sqq.) he makes the latter address him and those of similar descent as men of low birth, and in reply recounts the valuable

<sup>1</sup> Censorinus 14, 2.

services rendered by the plebs, leaving no room for doubt that he belongs to this class of citizens. The tone in general of his extended laudation of worth over against birth, in which this conversation occurs, points in the same direction. Aquinum, which Juvenal mentions as his native place (3, 319), was accordingly the home of his parents. That they had moderate means, but were not rich, we have already seen in our discussion of the son's education, inheritance, and professional career. The Satires, then, should be interpreted as the utterances of a thorough Roman of humble birth but proud of his Roman nationality, educated by his parents but not freed by their wealth from the necessity of taking, as soon as he was able, a serious part in the affairs of life.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

FRANK IVAN MERCHANT.

## VI.—AN EPIC FRAGMENT FROM OXYRHYNCHUS.

A negative indication of the value of the recent discoveries at Oxyrhynchus may be seen in the fact that the interesting epic fragment No. CCXIV seems to have escaped notice in the mass of comments that the publication of the Oxyrhynchus papyri has called forth. The papyrus which is referred by the editors "with little hesitation to the third century," contains parts of forty-three hexameters, and is, unfortunately, much mutilated. The editors translate only vv. 1-5, though the restoration of 10-13 is also complete.

The editor's restoration of vv. 1-5 is sufficiently certain to permit the printing of the text in the usual manner, with indications of only the chief supplements at the end of each line:

- 1 ἐξαπίνης ἐπέδῃσεν ἀνώϊστο[ισι κλάδοισι  
οὐ κεν ἔτι ζῶντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἀχαιοί·  
ἔνθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἐν[θ' Ἀγαμέμνων  
ᾤλετο, καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλλῆα  
5 Τηλέφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἐκτο[ρος ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν

The remaining verses to v. 16 as published in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. II, p. 28, are as follows:

- ἀλλ ὅποσον μοι καὶ τ[ο] ἀμυνμεν ἐ[  
χραιοῖσθαι δέ μοι α[. . . .] . α[  
ἦ καὶ ἀπ ἀργεῖοι <ο> λαχεν γεν[ος] ἠρακλῆος  
[τ]ηλεφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολεμῶν ἀπανέ[υθε  
10 [κλ]υτε μοι ἀθάνατοι [ς]εὺς δ[ε] π[λ]εον ον γενετῆρα  
δαρδανου ἡμετεροιο καὶ ἡ[ρα]κλῆος ἀκουω  
καὶ τούτων φρασσασθε μάχων λυσιν ἴσα δέ μυθοις  
[σ]υνθεσῆ τρωεσσι καὶ α[ργ]εῖοισι γε[ν]εσθω  
[ο]υδε ἀργεῖους θανε[ε]ιν [. . .] ἡσομαι αὐτῇ  
15 ξανθου φοινιξαντες ἐ[. . .] με . . χεῦμα καίκου  
τηλεφου εἰφι το[. . . . .] ου]κετι θωρηχθέντες

For the first two of these lines I have no suggestion to make, except that perhaps we should read in v. 7 *χραιομήσαι δέ μοι*

'A[ργείους] a[ . The supplement, if miswritten *αργίους*—cf. *ειφι* in v. 16 and the frequent interchange of *ει*—*ι* in the Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII "of the same period"—will contain exactly the number of letters required. The remainder I would restore as follows:

- εἰ καὶ ἀπ' Ἀργείοιο λάχεν γένος Ἡρακλῆος*  
*[Τηλέφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἑόντα]*  
 10 *κλυτὲ μοι ἀθάνατοι Ζεὺς δὲ πλεόν ὃν γενετῆρα*  
*Δαρδάνου ἡμετέριοιο καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ἀκούω*  
*καὶ τούτων φράσσασθε μαχῶν λύσιν· ἴσα δὲ μύθοις*  
*συνθεσίῃ Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀργείοισι γενέσθω.*  
*οὐδὲ <γάρ> Ἀργείους θανέειν ἀρήσομαι αὐτῇ*  
 15 *ξανθοῦ φοινίξαντας ἐν αἵματι χεῦμα Καΐκου*  
*Τηλέφου ἱφί δαμέντας· ὅτ' οὐκέτι θωρηχθέντες*

To this I would add the following commentary:—That the word at the beginning of line 8 means 'if' admits of but little doubt. Merkel in his preface to the minor edition of Apollonius Rhodius, p. v, speaks of the use of *ῆ* for *εἰ*, but it seems to me more probable that we have here merely a mistake of the scribe; cf. the similar Homer papyrus No. CCXXIII, E 128, *εἰμεν* for *ἡμεν*, and v. 64, *ἦδει* for *ῆδη*, though the latter may not be wholly due to phonetic causes. As long as vv. 6–7 are unrestored, it must remain uncertain whether v. 8 is to be connected with them or with vv. 10 ff.; but at present I prefer the latter alternative. For if Telephus is actually (*καί*) the descendant of Herakles, then the speaker, Astyoche, has a double claim upon Zeus: *ὃν γενετῆρα | Δαρδάνου ἡμετέριοιο καὶ Ἡρακλῆος ἀκούω*. For the thought cf. Quintus Smyrnaeus, 10. 40, 319, and 8. 431 ff.: *Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἰ ἔτεόν γε τῆς ἕξ εἰμι γενέθλης . . . τῷ μὲν νῦν ἐσάκουσον*, which affords also a parallel for the arrangement of the clauses—contrast, e. g., the prayer of the Cyclops, 1 528 ff. In this connection it may be noted that the author shows a similar unconventionality in his treatment of the unreal conditional sentence. In Homer, in unreal conditions of the past, the apodosis frequently, though not invariably (e. g. *ψ* 526) precedes; cf. the examples cited GMT., §§435, 440. However, this is not the case in the present unreal condition; cf. GMT., §438, for the examples. This order seems to have impressed the later imitators of Homeric poetry as characteristic, and they have imitated it with great consistency, just as they show a marked tendency to employ *πορί* as far as possible for *πρός*; cf. La Roche, Wiener Studien,

XXII 49. So in Apollonius Rhodius the apodosis precedes in I 1298; II 284, 626, 866, 987-995; III 584, 1139; IV 20, 901. The only exception is III 377 ff., which is practically an unreal condition of the present, and so conforms to the Homeric usage. So in the first seven books of Quintus we have this order: in I 447, 689, 775; II 507; III 26, 366, 514, 752; IV 301, 329, 563; V 359; VI 503, 542, 570, 644; VII 28, 142, as opposed to but two exceptions: III 444; V 583. Another departure from epic conventions is to be found in the use of the plural *κλύτε* in a prayer for which I know of no parallel, the citing of Il. 8. 5 by Liddell and Scott being a blunder. Besides, the singular when used in prayer, and the plural in addresses to men, is almost (cf. Quintus, 9. 9) invariably the first word of the speech. For the phrase *λαχεῖν γένος* cf. Musaios 30 *διοτρεφές αἶμα λαχούσα* and Quintus 2. 434 *Ζηνός ὑπερθύμοιο λαχὼν ἀριδείκτον αἶμα*.

But whether v. 8 be connected with what precedes or what follows, in neither case can v. 9 stand in its present position unless indeed *τηλεφον* be emended to *Τήλεφος*, in which case I do not see how a satisfactory close for the line can be obtained. The restitution suggested follows P 426 *μάχης ἀπάνευθεν ἔόντες*; a possible but less probable ending would have been *ἀπάνευθε μένοντα*. The occurrence of interpolated lines in the Homeric papyri is not uncommon, and the present instance is no more absurd than, e. g., the insertion after E 83 (O. P., vol. II, p. 101). I would offer the following explanation of its origin. The legend tells how the Greeks were at first successful, while Telephus was absent from the battle, but how he afterwards appeared and swept all before him, until finally he was wounded by Achilles. This crisis may very well have been introduced by some such lines as

οὐδ' ἰαχὴ κρατεροῖο<sup>1</sup> λάθην γένος Ἡρακλῆος  
Τήλεφον ἐν θαλάμοις πολέμων ἀπάνευθεν ἔόντα

For the general situation compare the opening of the fourteenth book of the Iliad; for the concrete use of *γένος*, Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1412, and Quintus 6. 120 *Εὐρύπυλον κρατεροῦ γένος Ἡρακλῆος*. If this line is an interpolation coming from a source of this sort, it follows that the speech before us is embedded in a narrative of the landing of the Greeks in Mysia. And if this is the case, there can

<sup>1</sup>Of course I do not mean to insist on the verbal exactness of the first half of this line. Another possibility would be, cf. Δ 456: *οὐδ' ἰαχὴ τε πόνος τε*.

hardly be any doubt that the poem was a working over of the material of the *Κύπρια*, bearing a relation to that poem similar to that which the *Τὰ μεθ' Ὀμηρον* of Quintus bear to the rest of the epic cycle. A further consequence is that the time of the delivery of this speech must be anterior to the situation in the *Iliad*. Now, this is in direct opposition to the conclusion which the editors draw from their translation of vv. 1-5. "The situation is therefore posterior to that in the *Iliad*," and as my restitution of vv. 14-16 turns in part on the same point, it is necessary to inquire into the cogency of this conclusion.

The editors evidently can not have based their conclusion upon the unreal condition in v. 2 οὐ κεν ἔτι ζῶντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί, for the most that it could have been cited to prove would have been that the Greeks had landed in the Troas—a time ten years before the situation in the *Iliad*. As a fact, however, it does not prove even that much, for it is merely a case—of a type familiar to us all in English—where the speaker, under the stress of emotion, regards as already accomplished that which now seems certain to happen when, had it not been for something, it might have been placed once for all beyond the bounds of possibility. The editors must therefore have drawn their inference from their translation of vv. 4-5: "and Telephus would have slain Achilles, the best warrior among the Argives before he met Hector." "Before he met Hector" in English warrants the conclusion, but πρὶν Ἑκτορος ἀντίον εἰλθεῖν in Greek does not. This doctrine should at the present time need no proof, as it has long since been distinctly stated; cf. e. g. Foerster apud Sturm, *Die Entwicklung der Constructionen mit ΠΡΙΝ*, p. 7: "dass der Infinitiv nach πρὶν den Begriff einer reinen Handlung bezeichne ohne weitere Angabe, ob eine solche wirklich eingetreten sei oder nicht"; and especially Gildersleeve, *A. J. P.* 2. 468, n.: "Πρὶν is an οὐπω. The 'not yet' may come later, may never come. As I have said of *antequam* with the subjunctive, the antecedence is necessary, not so the consequence, Ἀπέδρασαν πρὶν κριθῆναι, Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 35. They never came to trial." And p. 474: "In Attic it [πρὶν with inf.] . . . is necessary . . . when the action does not take place or is not to take place (= ὥστε μή)." After this it seems unnecessary to cite examples, but Apollonius Rhodius, III 374, 660 (πάρος), 800, 1395 are all instructive, and Eur. Rhesos 59 ff. (cf. Alc. 362) may be quoted in full: εἰ γὰρ φαεινοὶ μὴ ξυνέσχον ἡλίου | λαμπτήρες, οὐκ ἂν ἔσχον εὐτυχοῦν δόρυ, | πρὶν

ναῦς πυρῶσαι καὶ διὰ σκηνῶν μολεῖν | κτείνων Ἀχαιοὺς τῇδε πολυφόνῳ χειρί.  
So that the only inference that can be drawn is that the situation is anterior to the first meeting of Hector and Achilles and anterior to the landing of the Greeks in Troy, i. e. that the author followed a version of the legend different from that of the source of Tzetzes; cf. his *Tà prò 'Oμήρου*, 260 ff.

Since this is the case, no objection can be brought to bear on the restitution of ἀρ]ήσομαι in line 14. At the beginning of this line the editors suggest οὐδέ <κεν>, I prefer, however, οὐδέ <γάρ>, not only because it makes a better connection with what precedes, but also because the omission of γάρ before Ἀργείους is more easily explained.

In line 15, φοινίξαντες must, as the syntax shows, be either a misreading or miswriting for φοινίξαντας. Against ἐ[ν αἰ]μα[τι] may be brought objections of both a palaeographical and syntactical nature. In the first place the editors indicate that the lacuna is large enough to hold four letters; but N and A are letters that take a great deal of space, and, in the absence of a facsimile of this fragment, a comparison of the space occupied by ΝΑΙ in τὸν δ' ἴδεν Αἰνείας—No. CCXXIII, plate I, l. 13—which is equal to that sometimes occupied by four letters, will show that these letters may probably be considered as sufficient to fill the gap. The editors give the next two letters as με, which forces the assumption of a mistake on the part of the scribe, a difficulty that is lessened by his other mistakes—η, ἀργεῖοι, omission of <γάρ> and εἰφι—and to my mind is outweighed by the fact that the proposed reading fits both metre and sense, if it be admitted that the author would use ἐν with the dative as the equivalent of the instrumental.

This construction originates in the fact that frequently the same object may be considered either as the instrument or as the place in which an action happens. Hence we find, e. g., both πυρὶ κάειν and ἐν πυρὶ κάειν, the consequence of which is to efface the distinction that originally existed, and to extend the same duality of construction to other verbs where it is no longer logically justified. The beginnings of this encroachment of ἐν with the dative upon the instrumental dative go back to classical times; cf. Kühner-Gerth<sup>3</sup>, II 1, p. 464 f.; Lutz, *Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern*, p. 36; Sobolewski, *De praepositionum usu Aristoph.*, p. 26 f.; that it spread in post-classical times is recognized; cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gr. Gram.*, §1562, and for Polybius, Krebs, Schanz,

Beiträge, I, p. 71 f.; but the extent of its use in late epic poetry, in the absence of a monograph, is difficult to determine. From Apollonius I have noted: 2. 44 *φαιδρὸς ἐν ὄμμασιν*, rendered by Lehrs *alacer oculis*; contrast Arist. Knights 550 *φαιδρὸς λάμποντι μετώπῳ*; 4. 904 *ἐνὶ χερσὶν εἰς φόρμιγγα τανύσσας* = *manibus suis citharam intendens*. Compare also Musaios 159 *θυμὸν ἐρωτοτόκοισι παραπλάγξας ἐνὶ μύθοις* = *animum amorem-parientibus seducens* (in) *verbis*; Quintus 1. 343 *ὄβριμον ἐν στέρνοισιν ἀναπνέοντες Ἄρηα* = *pectore spirantes*; 1. 400 *τὰ δ' ἐν ποσὶν ἡμάλδυνεν* = *alias pedibus conculcat*; 4. 18 *τὸν δ' ἐν πυρὶ δηθέντα* = *igni consumptum*; contrast Soph. O. C. 1319 *ἄστυ δηώσκειν πυρὶ*; 4. 225 *συνέμαρψεν ἐνὶ στιβαρῇσι χέρεσσι* (?) = *corripuit robustis manibus*; and especially 4. 341 *μίξαι ἐν αἵματι χεῖρας ἀτειρέας* = *ut-tingerent sanguine manus invictas*. Furthermore, it may be noted that the MSS read in Eur. El. 1172 *ἀλλ' οἶδε μητρὸς νεοφόνους ἐν αἵμασι | πεφυρμένοι . . . πόδα*, and that the Laurentianus reads in Soph. O. T. 821 *λέχη δὲ τοῦ θανόντος ἐν χερσὶν ἐμαῖν | χραίνω*. Both passages have been corrected, but the errors, if errors they be, are not without significance for the later Greek usage. The above facts may, I think, warrant us in accepting for this poem the construction of *φοινίσσειν ἐν αἵματι* instead of the usual *φοινίσσειν αἵματι*, for which compare the examples cited in Liddell and Scott, and Quintus 9. 179.

The use of *ἴφι* in l. 16 in a periphrasis is without parallel, in Homer or Apollonius, nor do I know of an example from Quintus. The restitution of the next word is suggested by the frequent combination of *ἴφι δαμῆναι*; cf. also Quintus 6. 251 *βίη ῥοπάλοιο δαμέντα—βίη: ἴς = βίη: ἴφι*. The supplement proposed has exactly the number of letters indicated by the editors and accounts, besides, for the change to the nominative in *θωρηχθέντες*. For it to have been miswritten *ταμεντας* would have been nothing unusual, as the interchange of *τ* and *δ* in Egypt is very frequent; cf. No. CCXXIII, *passim*; Blass, *Aussprache*, p. 106.

In general style the poem seems to stand much nearer to the level of Quintus than of Apollonius, and I should not for that reason be inclined to place the time of its composition much before that of the writing of the papyrus.

A correspondence in mythology with Quintus remains to be noticed. The speaker is Astyoche, the wife of Telephus and daughter or granddaughter of Dardanus; the time is between the wounding of Telephus and the departure of the Greeks; everything would indicate also a time of truce, and hence there

can be little doubt that this poet's version of the healing of Telephus was the same as that followed by Quintus 4. 172 ff.:

(ἵππους) τοὺς πρόσθεν εὐμμελίῃ Ἀχιλῆι  
 Τηλεφος ὥπασε δῶρον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Καΐκου  
 εὐτέ ἐ μοχθίζοντα κακῶ περὶ ἔλκεϊ θυμὸν  
 ἠκέσατ' ἐγχείῃ τῇ μιν βάλε δηριόωντα  
 αὐτὸς ἔσω μηροῖο.

which Welcker, *Kleine Schriften*, III, p. 30, n., regarded as an invention of the Smyrnaean poet.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, *Feb.* 4, 1901.

## VII.—MANUSCRIPT COPIES OF PRINTED GERMAN BIBLES.

### I. *Wolfenbüttel MS Aug. fol. 1 A, 1 B.*

This MS, consisting of two folio volumes of 367 and 362 leaves respectively, was completed by *Martin Huber Tütscher schulmaister zu Memmingen*, on Saint Otmar's Day, 1481, as is stated in the inscription at the end. Walther<sup>1</sup> describes the MS, the text of which was taken from the Mentel Bible of 1466 and from another one belonging to the group headed by the Zainer Bible of 1473.

The dialect is Suabian throughout, as the name of the town, *Memmingen*, might lead one to expect. Accordingly, the new Bavarian diphthongs of the printed Bibles were regularly changed back to the old undiphthongized long vowels, except in a few instances, such as Gen. 34, 9 *geleiche*; Jos. 22, 26 *euch*, *gezeug*; I Ezra 4, 2 *euch*, *euwern*; etc. The diphthong *eu* is more frequent than *ei*, *au*, and occurs more especially in the word *euch*. Middle High German *â* is uniformly replaced by the Suabian *au*, which is expressed by *au*, *ā* or *ǣ*. Both of the latter signs are of frequent occurrence in Suabian MSS of this period, but Walther is undecided whether these "peculiar marks" over *a* and *o* are to serve as marks of length or to represent the letter *u*. MHG. *ou* and *û* are also represented by these signs: *öch*, *öch*, *höpt*, *trämer*, *wiröch*, *versämen*. Instances in which *au*, *ā*, *ǣ* correspond to MHG. *â* are found on every page: *gän*, *gän*, *läss*, *laussen*, *frägen*, *frauen*, *uffslän*, *ufstaun*, *ständ*, *schlauff*, *rautfraugen*, *gedauchten*, etc.

We now pass to the discussion of the immediate origin of the text of the MS. Walther has correctly stated that the beginning, from Genesis to Judges 6, was taken from Mentel. The curious error of Mentel in Exod. 15, 1, *das rose* instead of *das ross*, is also found here. Leaf 12 of the MS has been torn out, causing a gap from Gen. 9, 17 to 11, 26; f. 11 ends: *gelübtes dz ich hab geord-*

<sup>1</sup> Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters, dargestellt von W. Walther, Braunschweig, 1889-92.

net zwischen, and f. 13 begins: *und gebar sün und töchter und thare lebt . . .*

In the sixth chapter of Judges both of the printed Bibles were before the scribe, as will appear from the following agreements: V. 1: Wolfenbüttel and Mentel have *wan*, Zainer has *aber*; W and Z have *angesicht*, M has *bescheud*; v. 3: W and M have *oster*, Z has *auffgang der sun*; v. 4: W, M have *mit all*, Z has *gantz*; v. 5: W, M have *kemel*, Z has *kamel tier*; v. 9: W, M have *quellen*, Z has *peinigten*; v. 11: W, M have *frucht*, Z has *getreyd*; v. 15: W, Z have *ingesind*, M has *geschlecht*; v. 16: W, Z have *du wirst schlagen*, M has *du schlechst*. From here on the text of Zainer is followed to the end of chapter 48 of Jeremiah. This is in the second volume, which begins with Ecclesiastes. On f. 71r. of volume 2 a new scribe sets in at the words *ich ging nit hinder sich*, Is. 50, 5. This second scribe continues to f. 104v., third line, ending at Jer. 38, 23, *und alle dine wib*. The first scribe here resumes his task in the middle of the sentence, at the words *und dine sune*.

Throughout these changes the text followed is that of the Zainer Bible. In Jer. 48 there are no traces of Mentel. At the beginning of the next chapter, however, the text follows first Mentel, then Zainer. The writing here is smaller, though the scribe is the same. He probably made a pause here, and when he resumed work had both texts before him, as is shown by the following readings: Jer. 49, 1, W, M have *besiczt*, Z has *hat besessen*, W, Z have *hant gewonet*, M has *entwelt*; v. 2: W, Z have *verwustet und zerstört in aim ufflauff*, M has *verwustet in eim wuffe*; v. 3: W, M have *rüffet*, Z has *schreiend*, W, Z have *klaidern, priester*, M has *klayt, pfaffen*; v. 4: W, Z have *glorierstu*, M has *wunniglichstu*; v. 5: W, M have *ich zu für*, Z has *ich will einfure*, W, Z have *umschwaif*, M has *umbhalbung*.

This state of affairs continues through the chapter, and into the following one: Jer. 50, 2, W has *geschent*, Z *geschendet*, M *geschemlicht*, W, M have *uberkomen, ir gegossen*, Z has *uberwunden, ir gehaune*; v. 3: W, M have *staig uff wider sy von aquilon*, Z has *wirt aufsteigen wider sy von mitnacht*. From this point on the text of Mentel is followed, until in the second chapter of Jonah, Zainer's text is again adopted: Jon. 1, 11, W, M have *mer hort uff*, Z has *möre auffhöre*; v. 14: W has *die man rüfften*, M has *die man rieffen*, Z has *sy schryen*; Jon. 2, 1, W, Z have *hett vorberait*, M has *furbereyt*; v. 3: W, Z have *ich hab geschrien*,

M has *ich rieff*; v. 5: W, Z have *wird ich sechen*, M has *sich ich*. Beginning with Jon. 2, therefore, the text of Zainer is again followed, continuing into the New Testament.

A third scribe sets in at the top of f. 182v. of volume 2: *Caspor und Mageth und Carnaim* (I Mac. 5, 28). This scribe completed the two books of the Maccabees. The New Testament, which begins on f. 211r., was written entirely by the first scribe. Traces of Mentel's text reappear in I Peter 2, 6: W, M have *erwelt und edel*, Z has *bewâret ausserwôlt kostber*; v. 7: W, M have *wan, vorsprachen*, Z has *aber, verwarffen*. From the ninth verse on there is no further trace of Zainer. Walther states that Mentel's text sets in at the third chapter of I Peter, continuing to Rev. 18, while from Rev. 19 to the end the text is that of Zainer. Both of these statements are inaccurate; Zainer's text reappears only in the last chapter. The last verse of chapter 21 is given as follows in W, M: *kain ding entzübert gait in sy dz da tût die verbannen-schaft und die luge nun* (M *neur*) *allain die da sind geschriben in dem buch des lebens und des lambs*. In Z this is quite different: *noch nichts vermeyligets wirt eingeen in ir oder das da thue ain verflucht ding oder luge. nur allain die da seind geschriben in dem buch des lebens und des lambs*. In chapter 22, 1, however, W, Z have *schinbar*, M has *leuchtent*, W, Z have *stûl*, M has *gesess*; v. 2: W, Z have *in der mitt, frûcht*, M has *in miczt, wucher*. From here on to the end the text is that of Zainer.

What is this later Bible which we have styled *Zainer*? Walther, col. 131, states that it is either the Zainer edition of 1473, Zainer of 1477, Sorg of 1477 or Sorg of 1480. Later on he surmises that it is "*eine revidierte, vermutlich die 4. Bibel*" (Zainer, 1473). This latter conjecture is correct, as will appear from the readings given below. The so-called *Schweizer Bibel* is out of the question on account of its many variants, as I have shown elsewhere (Journal of Germanic Phil. III 238-47). The Sorg 1477 edition is excluded by its variants: Ps. 73, 8 *das geschlâcht*; Jer. 35, 11 *antlucz der syrier*; I Mac. 4, 36 *aussgen*; 6, 59 *setzten*: the Wolfenbüttel MS and all the other printed texts here have *ir geschlâcht, antlucz des höres, aufgan, sechen*. In addition Sorg 1477 alone omits *im*, Ps. 94, 2; *unser*, I Mac. 3, 43; inserts *uncz*, Is. 7, 6. The editions of Zainer 1477 and Sorg 1480 are excluded by their readings of *zû uns*, I Reg. 4, 3; *unbeschnitten*, 14, 6; *genachnet*, Mat. 26, 46; *grosse*, Joh. 6, 2; *iob sprach*, Job 34, 4: the Wolfenbüttel MS and Zainer 1473 here read *uns*

*zu, umbeschnitten, genahet, michel, iob der sprach.* Instances from I Cor. 5, 8 and Ps. 33, 4, where Zainer 1473 and the Wolfenbüttel MS vary from all the other texts, might also be cited. The presence of the words *der welt*, Hab. 3, 6, shows further that the text which I have elsewhere designated 1473<sup>b</sup> was used.

There is only one reading which seems to go counter to the above conclusion that Zainer 1473 was used, but this is an important one. In I Mac. 9, 44 the Latin imperative *surgamus* is rendered *wir wollen uffsten* in the Wolfenbüttel MS, in accordance with Zainer 1477 and Sorg 1480. Zainer 1473 and Sorg 1477 here have *wir sollen aufsten*. Out of more than 250 instances of the first person plural imperative in these texts, this is the only one where a variant occurs. The change was made by Zainer 1477 and copied by Sorg 1480. It is manifestly impossible that the Wolfenbüttel scribe should have made this change by mere chance just at the same place where Zainer 1477 made it, the more so since this is the only change of the kind which was made by either.

We are therefore forced to the conclusion that in this passage the scribe of the Wolfenbüttel MS copied from Zainer 1477 or Sorg 1480. But how far does this dependence extend? Since noting the above variant in the Book of Maccabees I have had no further opportunity of comparing the texts concerned, and a number of additional passages from Maccabees yield no result, as in them Zainer 1473 and 1477 agree. It will be remembered, however, that the work of the third scribe was confined to the portion extending from I Mac. 5, 28 to the end of II Mac. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that the edition of Zainer 1477 or Sorg 1480 was used only in this part, for at the beginning of the New Testament, where the first scribe sets in again, the text follows that of Zainer 1473. It is to be noted, further, that all the changes from Mentel to Zainer and from Zainer to Mentel were made by the first scribe, who completed the work, signing his name as *Martin Huber Tütscher schulmaister*. Of these changes of text Walther notes only the first, fourth and fifth, the two latter being put at the wrong place. The scribes are not mentioned at all by him.

## II. *Codex Germanicus Monacensis 204, 205.*

This MS, which is in two large folio volumes, is mentioned by Walther, cols. 134, 135. The text agrees very closely with that

of Mentel's Bible, which was printed at Strassburg about the year 1466. Errors of Mentel, such as *edeum* for *e denn*, Gen. 11, 4; *und* for *uncz*, II Esdr. 4, 21; *doch* for *dich*, II Ezra 6, 10, are all shared by Cgm. 204-5. But such agreements do not prove absolutely that this MS is a copy of the printed Bible, as long as the original from which the latter copied is unknown. This MS might have contained the errors in question, transmitting them to Mentel's Bible and to Cgm. 204-5 independently. But the following circumstance proves indisputably that Cgm. 204-5 is a direct copy of Mentel's Bible.

On f. 362v. of Cgm. 204, about four inches from the bottom of the second column, are the words *wirt guot den die got rechte*. The remainder of the column contains only the words *gaissen und dem hindenkalb der hirschen auff den bergen arometen* (end of page). The next page, f. 363r., contains an illustration, and the text begins: *Incipit prologus in libro sapientiae*.

The first of the above quotations is from Ecclesiastes 8, 12 (*bonum timentibus Deum*), while the words after the break, which do not fit in at all, are from Cantic. 8, 14, the last verse of that book (*capreae hinnuloque cervorum super montes aromatum*). Consequently, the latter part of the Book of Ecclesiastes (from 8, 12 to the end) and all of Solomon's Song except a part of the last verse, are omitted in Cgm. 204. This gap can not be due to the loss of a number of leaves in Cgm. 204, as the MS shows no defect and the gap does not occur at the end of a leaf. A comparison with the Mentel Bible, however, fully explains the omission.

Here f. 204v. ends *wirt güt den die got*, and f. 205r. correctly continues *furchtē: die do furchtent sein antlutz*. Folio 207r. begins *rech gaissen und dem hindenkalb der hirschen auf den bergen aromathen* (end of Solomon's Song). It is evident that the portion of the text omitted in Cgm. 204 corresponds exactly to the contents of ff. 205, 206 of Mentel, and this coincidence shows conclusively that the MS is a direct copy from Mentel.

Several other features of the MS deserve mention. First of all the scribes. The first one generally copied the text of Mentel without change, except in the case of the words *aus*, *auf*, which he changed uniformly to *us*, *uff*. In a few cases an old *i* replaced the new diphthong *ei* of Mentel, and the word *haus* was generally changed to *hus*. In all other cases the new diphthongs of Mentel were reproduced. In a number of instances this scribe even changed an old *ei* of Mentel to *ai*; for example, *ainen*, Gen. 1, 26;

*ainen, allain*, Gen. 2, 18; *ainer, stain, laimig*, Gen. 11, 3; *getailt*, Gen. 11, 4. It may even be said that this change is regular with this scribe. The form *geen*, 1st p. pl. pres. ind. and imperative, was also frequently supplanted by *gangen*, as in Exod. 5, 8, 17; Deut. 13, 6, 13; I Reg. 11, 4. The scribe therefore was most probably a Suabian living near the Bavarian border. He continued to IV Reg. 23, 8, ending with the word *fursten*. With the following words, *der stat*, another scribe began. This is on f. 183v., col. 1, l. 25 of Cgm. 204. Immediately before the change we find numerous instances of *uff, uf, uswurffen, hus*, while in the portion written by the second scribe we find only *auff, aus*, the forms which occur in Mentel; instances may be found as early as l. 28, col. 1, f. 183v. The second scribe continued to substitute *ai* for *ei*, but he did not introduce the form *gangen*. He was, however, also a Suabian, for there are numerous instances of forms such as *aubent, schlauf, schläf, gethän, rät, wären, jür, äss, schäffen, nämen, wäffen, wäppen, lägen*, where Middle High German *ä* has been changed to *au*. This is one of the chief characteristics of the Suabian dialect in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. That the sign *ä* is equivalent to *au* is proved by parallel forms such as *schlauff, schläf*. The old diphthong *ou* is also represented by this sign, as in *weyrächs*, Luc. 1, 11; also the new diphthong *au* in *täben*, Jer. 46, 16.

A further indication of the dialect of the scribe is found in I Cor. 10, 9, where the number *XXIII. M* of Mentel is written out: *drew und czwaintzig tusent*. This is half Bavarian and half Suabian, *drew* being decidedly Bavarian, while *tusent* is the undiphthongized Suabian form. This scribe wrote the rest of the work.

At the end of the first volume, Cgm. 204, there is the inscription: *1473 ward daz | buoch gantz aussgemacht nach den obresten* (= Epiphany). The second volume, Cgm. 205, has at the end this inscription: *Finis huius libri | 1472/3 mittichen vor wiñnachten alz auss | gemacht Ihs marya*. Walther, col. 134, reads this as follows: *1472 | 3 wuchē vā wihnchtē alz auss | gemacht Jh's murger* [?]. He advisedly adds a question-mark, for the last two words are beyond doubt *Jesus Maria*, and not the name of the scribe, as conjectured by Walther. The word *mittichen*, which is a variant form of *Mittwoch*, is not as distinct as the rest, but Dr. Riezler, Librarian at Munich, confirms my interpretation.

With regard to Walther's *3 wuchen*, it may be noted that it is entirely foreign to mediaeval usage to write dates in this fashion,

three weeks, or even one week, before a given festival or saint's day. The invariable usage is to write the saint's day on which an event occurred, or else name the day of the week before or after the nearest festival or prominent saint's day.

We have therefore the strange phenomenon that the first volume bears a later date than the second. This is due to the fact that the last two leaves of the first volume were inserted subsequent to the writing of the second volume. These two leaves contain the latter part of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, from chap. 50, 8 to the end, beginning with the words *schmeckent in den tagen des sumers* . . . The ink is much darker than that of the preceding pages, and the watermark of the paper is an eight-pointed star in a circle, while all the other leaves of this volume have a crown and a triangle joined by a bar.

The scribe commenced with a stock of the crown-and-triangle paper, which lasted as far as f. 292 of the second volume. The remainder of this volume consists of the paper with the star watermark. The scribe completed the second volume, on the Wednesday before Christmas, 1472/3, which date was December 23. Subsequently the last two leaves of the first volume were replaced, and the date of this final completion was after Epiphany (Jan. 6), 1473.

The former last leaf of the first volume I discovered pasted to the front inside cover of the second volume. Only the first page had been written upon, the other side being blank with the exception of the rubric *ysaias* at the top, corresponding to *pphetia* on the first page of the second volume. This shows that originally the scribe had expected to make one volume out of his MS, as the Mentel Bible was in one volume. But later, on account of the bulk of the MS, a division was made between Ecclesiasticus and Isaiah, the regular division of the Vulgate. Then, however, the last leaf of the first volume contained the rubric *ysaias*, and therefore it was replaced, together with the preceding one, the volume being of folio size. The old leaf has no inscription containing the date. The text agrees with that of the new leaf, except that the latter omits the phrase *zu im und du hast sie geredt*. The preceding clause also ends with *geredt*, and the scribe jumped from one to the other. On the old leaf the word *geredt* stands at the beginning of a line in both instances, hence the omission was the more readily made.

## NOTES.

### SOPH. AJAX 143.

In Mr. Edwin W. Fay's article on 'The Aryan God of Lightning' (A. J. P. XVII 1-29), it will be remembered, allusion is made to a possible "primitive confusion of the stems *ekwe* 'horse' and *aga-* 'water' (perhaps *\*akwa*) in the Aryan Period, with the added semasic interpretation of both stems by 'run,' a *nomen agentis* to the stem *ākē* 'sharp, swift'" (p. 3). This was supported in a way by names of rivers cited by Sibree, such as Sk. *aṣvāvatī*, Gr. Pers. *Hyd-aspes*, Gk. *Μελανίππιον*, *Ἀγανίππη*. Reference was further made to the *aṣvatthā*-tree, it being "characteristic of the fig genus 'to abound in milky juice.'" Homer was then adduced, Δ 500:

ὅς οἱ Ἀβυδόθεν ἦλθε παρ' ἵππων ὠκείων, (ἱππῶν ?)

'from beside the swift waters.'

Mr. Fay also has called attention to *ἱκκος*, and the "certainty of a stem *ik-* in Greek as testified by *ικμάς* 'moisture' and *ἱξαι* 'διηθῆσαι' (Hesych.)."

If we turn to Soph. Ajax 1206 we see the picture of the encampment by night:

κέϊμαι δ' ἀμέριμνος οὕτως  
ἀεὶ πυκναῖς δρόσοις τεγγόμενος κόμας  
λυγρὰς μνήματα Τροίας.

Thus the Salaminian mariner whose bones sea-fogs alone would not have caused to ache.

Now, Ajax' midnight adventure is described by this rheumatic squire 143:

σὲ τὸν ἵππομανῇ  
λειμῶν' ἐπιβάντ' ὀλέσαι Δαναῶν  
βοτὰ καὶ λείαν . . .

The Greek's fondness for etymologizing—fostered perhaps by the Mysteries, for may not Aischylos have been on the point of an etymological disclosure when his audience refused to allow him to proceed?—is apparent in Sophokles, although more artis-

tically applied than in Euripides, who must have been spoiled by Sokrates. It would not be an injustice to the passage under consideration to convey into *ἵππομανῇ* a meaning in accordance with Mr. Fay's *ἵππη*, and suiting the ethos of the speaker and the genius of the poet. *ἵππομανῇ λειμῶνα* then I would translate 'the meadow with its mad rills,' or (referring to Jebb ad loc.) comparing Fr. 591 *καρπομανῆς*, 'abounding in water.' *λειμῶνα* incidentally suggests the etymology.

Theok. Id. 2, 48 (quoted by Jebb, Soph. Aj., Appendix) has

*Ἴππομανὲς φυτὸν ἐστὶ παρ' Ἀρκάσι, τῷ δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσαι  
καὶ πῶλοι μαίνονται ἀν' ὄρεα καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι.*

For *Ἴππομανὲς* cf. Sk. *agvatthā* of the fig-tree as indicative of its succulence, and with Theok. cf. the derivation thereof, "*thā* = *stha*, under which horses stand."

It is significant that in Aj. 601 *ΛΕΙΜΩΝΙΑΙΤΤΟΙΑΙ* has not yet been satisfactorily reconstructed.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.

HENRY N. SANDERS.

#### AN AESOPIC FABLE IN OLD FRENCH PROSE.

Although Aesop's Fables were great favorites in France during the Middle Ages, it is very rarely that they are met with in the manuscripts in any other than a metrical form. The following prose text is an isolated instance found in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 435, fo. 46 vo, col. 1, to fo. 46 vo, col. 2.

It is a well-known fact that fable collections in France during the earlier centuries went by the name of *ysopet*, a diminutive of Aesop's very name, but the present instance appears to be a more sporadic use of this term to denote the supposed author himself.

As the text here given has never before appeared in print, and as it possesses the two points of special interest noted above, its publication may perhaps not prove unwelcome as an addition to our knowledge of popular literature in Europe before the Renaissance.

#### *Exemple au propos de flacter.*

Ysopet raconte en ses fables morales de deux hommes dont l'un estoit veritable et l'autre flacteur. Ilz alerent vne foiz en la regnon des cinges et les trouuerent assemblez en vng lieu. Le

maistre des cinges qui seoit en son trosne audessus des autres appella le flacteur et luy demanda : "Qui suis je," dist il, "et qui sont ceulx qui me seruent?" "Tu es," dist celluy, "vng empe-  
reur, et ceulx cy sont tes princes, tes ducs et tes barons." Icelluy fist le maistre singe grant honneur et luy feist moult de biens. Quant celluy qui ne sauoit flater ne mentir vit ainsi honorer son compaignon pour mentir, il dist en luy mesmes : "Ce mon compaignon pour flacter et mentir a este ainsi honore. O! comme le seray je haultement pour dire verite." Le maistre singe l'appella et luy demanda qu'il luy sembloit de luy et de ses gens. "Tu es," dist il, "vng cinge, et tous ceulx d'entour toy sont cinges." Lors tout incontinent le cinge et ses subgetz luy rovirent sus et fut tout desclue, esgratigne et malmene.

Par lequel exemple nous est donc a entendre que la verite n'est pas tousiours bonne a dire ; car les prelatz et les princes ne veulent ouyr dire que li coses qui leur plaisent. Bien sont singes ceulx qui font ou seussient faire les cingeries en leurs maisons, et qui croient plus tost vng flacteur que vng homme veritable.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Prohibitives in Silver Latin. By WILLARD K. CLEMENT. Reprint from A. J. P., vol. XXI 2. 1900.

I did not suppose that I could be tempted into writing anything more on the subject of the Latin Prohibitive, but Professor Clement's method of criticism is so unusual, and his comments would be so utterly misleading to the casual reader, that I must, in justice to myself, say one word more. It is unfortunate that Clement did not devote greater care to the preparation of his article, as he has undoubtedly collected much valuable material. In its present form, however, the article is, in most respects, quite without value, so far as its criticism of my own views is concerned, on account of its numerous inaccuracies and its utter lack of discrimination between relevant and irrelevant matter.

In my articles on the Latin Prohibitive I made the claim that, *prior to the time of Livy*, the perfect tense in prohibitions differed from the present in being a more energetic form of expression. Clement's method of combating this claim is to cite some instances *from Silver Latin* which he does not think in harmony with it. One might as well try to refute the grammar-rule that *quamquam* takes the indicative in classical prose by citing from Silver Latin the numerous instances of the subjunctive.

Whatever might have been shown to be the usage of Silver Latin, my claim as to earlier times would have remained quite unaffected. However, after examining such of Clement's statistics as really have a bearing upon my theory, I am now quite ready to assert, as I could not have done when I wrote my Latin Prohibitive, that the claim I made for earlier times holds also, in all its essential features, for Silver Latin, and to treat Clement's article as though my claim had originally been framed in such a way as to cover the latter period also.

The distinction I made between the two tenses was made solely with reference to independent prohibitions introduced by *ne* (*neve*) and *cave*. In attempting to prove false this distinction, Clement cites a curious mixture of subordinate clauses, undoubted contingent-future ('potential') subjunctives, mere conjectural readings, and subjunctives with *nec*, *minime*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *nihil*, *numquam*, *non*, and *vide*. When Clement professes to discuss a certain claim of mine, I surely have a right to insist that he shall take that claim as it stands, without any additions or modifications. In that part of the Latin Prohibitive which prompted Clement's

paper, not a word was said by me regarding the subjunctive uses with *nec*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc., except an emphatic statement to the effect that they lay entirely outside of my theory and had characteristics very different from those of the instances I was going to discuss. What possible objection can Clement have to doing in reality what he professes to be doing? What possible objection can he have to separating (at least temporarily, for the purpose of testing my claim), in his discussion as he does in his headings, the instances of *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* from those of *nec*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc.? Such a separation could not by any possibility affect his discussion or his conclusions in any way detrimental to the truth. If the instances with the latter words present the same general characteristics as those with the former, then his conclusions would not be affected at all by the fact that he had temporarily separated the two sorts of instances. On the other hand, if the two classes of instances are found to show important differences in usage (differences that can not be accounted for by mere chance), then surely it would be quite inexcusable in any one not to recognize the justice of treating the two sorts of clauses separately. In either case, then, such a method of procedure as I suggest would have been perfectly fair to Clement's side of the case, and it would have had the additional advantage of being fair to mine.

In the following discussion I will confine myself, as I did in my original article, exclusively to the instances of *ne* (*neve*) and *cave*. Clement cites 25 such instances of the perfect tense (pp. 156 ff.). Of these 25 instances, he admits at the outset that 17 are in accord with the distinction I made. At first he classifies all of the remaining 8 instances as being not in accord with my theory; but a little later he decides (pp. 164-5) that 5 of these 8 instances are not necessarily against it, after all. In other words, he finds, according to his own admission, only 3, out of a total of 25 instances, which he considers as distinctly opposed to my theory that the perfect tense indicates energetic utterance, prompted by alarm due to fear that the prohibited act will be performed. Let us examine these 3 alleged exceptions:

Phaedr. App. 26, 3 *ne timueris*. Just as I was on the point of admitting that this is a clear violation of my theory, I discovered that *ne timueris* is merely one of several conjectures, and has not the slightest authority of any kind whatever. All the other conjectures have the present tense, which would be in complete accord with my theory.

Tac. Ann. VI 8 *ne ultimum Seiani diem, sed sedecim annos cogitaveritis*. Here I fear that Clement neglected to read the context. Failure to heed this prohibition will inevitably result in the speaker's condemnation and death. The speaker is on trial, charged with being a friend and accomplice of Sejanus. He says, in effect, to his judges: 'Do not think of

me as intimate with Sejanus on his last day, and for that reason condemn me as implicated in his crimes; but think of me rather as his friend of former years, when all men were proud to claim Sejanus as their friend.'

Mart. II 68, 3. If this prohibition is not complied with, the speaker's former *rex* and *dominus* will call him insolent, an act which might or might not prompt energetic prohibition, according to the speaker's feelings regarding it.

These are the 3 instances upon which Clement depends for the refutation of my claim that the perfect tense with *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* indicates energetic utterance! Surely, further comment is unnecessary on this part of his paper.

The most unfortunate part of Clement's discussion is his treatment of the present subjunctive. He has here classified his instances in a hit-or-miss way, sometimes apparently without even so much as testing a given expression to see whether it can be construed as a prohibition or not. He has included in his list of prohibitions instances which no amount of violence could distort into prohibitions. This statement may be verified by a mere glance at pages 161 and 163, for example, where instances of *nec possis* are repeatedly cited as prohibitions. Who ever heard of such a prohibition as 'And do not be able' (as though 'being able' were something that could be ordered or prohibited)? Similarly *nec adsequere*, cited (p. 163) from Tac. Ann. 6, 8, is not a prohibition and is not regarded as such by any editor or commentator. Again, cases of the subjunctive introduced by *neque enim* are classed by Clement as prohibitions. They have, of course, the same modal force as that illustrated in *nec enim numeraverim* (Cic. Brut. 47, 173), *neque enim fugerim* (de orat. III 38, 153), etc. *Neque enim* is confined to explanatory and illustrative statements, and is not used with a prohibitive subjunctive for the same reason that it is not used with the imperative mood.

Further evidence of inexcusable carelessness will be noticed in Clement's free intermixture of subordinate clauses (*oro ne facias*, etc.) with prohibitions proper. If Clement read my own discussion as carefully as he ought to have done before attempting to criticise me, he must have noticed that I said on pp. 135 (3) and 149 (17) of The Latin Prohibitive that clauses of the type *oro ne facias* were, as a matter of course, excluded from my discussion (with the exception of some four or five instances in which an accompanying imperative, the order of words, or some other consideration made it probable that the *ne*-clause was independent), and that I had not even attempted to collect the very numerous instances of this use. And if he did notice this, I am surprised that it did not seem to him quite unjust to me to cite against me all the numerous instances of such a usage in Silver Latin, and thus to give the impression that they belong to the phenomena

that I myself discussed. In discussing the distinction between tenses in prohibitions, the type of expression represented by *oro ne facias* should not enter into consideration, for the reason that one can never say that the *ne*-clause is not a subordinate clause. Indeed, all such clauses in Cicero (and he is full of them) have almost uniformly been regarded as subordinate. If a single one of them could be positively proved to be independent, the theory that *ne* with the present subjunctive in prohibitions is foreign to Ciceronian prose (except when addressed to an indefinite second person) would be dead without further discussion. It is a grammatical commonplace that, in the process of subordination, distinctions observed in independent clauses are very frequently obliterated. Such an obliteration of tense-distinctions has occurred in the type *oro ne facias*. Many such instances of the present in Cicero are full of emotion and involve acts that are regarded with great alarm. But what has all this to do with my distinction between tenses? The perfect tense is, as far as I am aware, quite unknown in clauses of this type, with the exception of a few cases in early Latin, where they may have been felt as *quasi*-independent clauses.

It may be that the levelling influences of subordination are discernible even in the *cave*-constructions. At any rate, *cave* was used in early Latin with both tenses. But before the time of Cicero, the use of the perfect tense with *cave* had practically disappeared. The only instances I know of after Terence are Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 38 and Curt. Ruf. 5, 2, 21.

The subordinate clauses which must be excluded from Clement's collection of instances are the following: Phaedr. App. 26, 3-4; Curt. Ruf. 6, 3, 12 ('I say this, lest, etc.');

9, 2, 28; Il. Lat. 330; 724; Apul. Met. 22 (19, 3); 8, 8 (169, 24-26; this is of course a clause of proviso introduced, as frequently, by *modo* (= *dummodo*)); Dracont. 5, 276 ('lest');

Sil. Ital. 17, 367 (*oro* occasionally takes subjunctive without *ut* at all periods); Incert. (Baehrens 3, p. 273). Most of the remaining instances of *ne* and *cave* with the present, that are cited against me by Clement, support my theory so conspicuously that I can not account for his classification of them except by supposing that, through some oversight, they got into the wrong column. Certainly no one could seriously regard the acts prohibited by them as being of an alarming character that would in any way be likely to call forth vigorous utterance. That each reader may convince himself of the truth of this statement, I cite below all the instances of *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* with the present, adding after each reference the result that will follow a failure to comply with the prohibition. It will be seen that the result in the following instances will never be disastrous:

Pers. 3, 96: the speaker's life will or may be saved by his friend's insisting that he shall care for his illness.

- Pers. 5, 170: Chaerestratus will attempt to free himself from a disreputable life (see Gildersleeve's translation of lines 161-175).
- Stat. Theb. 3, 241 *neu me temptare precando certetis*: the speaker will have a request addressed to him (*ne pugnate* is the usual reading earlier in the verse, and is probably correct).
- Stat. Silv. 4, 9, 55: a friend, having received some of the speaker's verses, will send some of his own in reply (in a spirit of fun).
- Mart. 11, 55, 2: Urbicus will have an own child to inherit his property rather than a scheming pretended friend.
- Pseud.-Quint. 201, 9: the speaker himself indicates the insignificant result of non-compliance, by the following *ne videaris*, etc.
- Vespa 62: the speaker, a cook, will lose a debate on the relative merits of his own calling as compared with that of a baker.
- Auson. 296, 83: } no one will ever so much as know  
 Sen. Troad. 553 (562): } whether these prohibitions are complied with or not.
- Apul. 7, 5 (146, 3): the speaker will not be recognized as the famous robber he claims to be.
- Curt. Ruf. 4, 1, 22 (reading uncertain): the person addressed will forget that he was once poor.
- Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26: the person addressed will spare the speaker's feelings so far as possible in narrating what has happened.
- Apul. 2, 10 (30, 6): a mere jest, disregarded (and meant to be disregarded) alike by the speaker and the person addressed (to the ecstatic happiness of both of them).
- Auson., p. 301, l. 190 (Peiper): the speaker will be blamed, but he considers such blame of too little account to cause any change in his manner of living.

It should be remembered that the cases above cited are *only those that are, according to Clement, least favorable to my theory*. I am passing by unnoticed the much larger number of those that are admitted by Clement himself to support the theory. It will be seen, then, that out of the total of 63 instances of *ne* (*neve*) and *cave* with the present subjunctive, cited by Clement, there remain only 7 in which the result would be disastrous, if the prohibition were not to be heeded. One of these—Baehrens 3, p. 300 (*ne referas*)—can hardly be regarded as having any weight, as this is a perfectly formal prayer of the cheeriest kind. The assurance of safety and divine favor breathes through the entire prayer. There is therefore nothing to call forth energetic utterance. In the remaining 6 instances (Avian. 9, 23; Dracont. 5, 273; Stat. Theb. 3, 665; 6, 893; Mart. 6, 78, 3; Curt. 7, 8, 28) the acts prohibited are of such a character as naturally to call forth energetic utterance. But two of these are instances of *cave*, and can therefore hardly have as much weight as similar instances in Plautus, as the perfect with *cave* had, generally speaking, long

since gone out of use (see above). Our examination of the present tense has, then, resulted in showing that over 90 per cent. (93 per cent.?) of the instances (57 (59?) out of a total of 63) are in perfect accord with my theory. Of the 6 (4?) exceptions it is enough to say that, when a man is alarmed at a threatening danger he does not always use the most energetic expression that a language affords.

On p. 165 Clement takes "at random" numerous examples of the present tense and states what the disastrous results would be in case of a failure to comply with the prohibition. An examination of the passages referred to (one has to search for them, as citations are omitted) will disclose the fact (a surprising one, no doubt, to Clement) that only 3 of them belong to the phenomena under discussion (i. e. are introduced by *ne* (*neve*) or *cave*; and of these 3 instances, one (Stat. Theb. 3, 241) assumes as correct an uncertain reading (*ne pugnare*) that is rejected by nearly all editors, and in another (Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26 *cave auribus parcas*) a failure to comply would be quite the opposite of disastrous. In other words, he cites against me only one instance (Mart. 6, 78, 3 *bibas caveto*) out of a total of 63 instances, and this is with *cave*, which, as seen above, had before the time of Martial come to be used only with the present tense. And still Clement apparently thinks that he is making out a strong case against my theory!

It is, I hope, clear from the above discussion that the distinction I drew for classical times between *ne feceris* and *ne facias* still holds perfectly good (with rare exceptions) in Silver Latin. Whether a similar distinction will hold good for the genuine prohibitions with *neque* (*nec*), *nihil*, *numquam*, *nullus*, *minime*, etc., I can not say. Whether it will or not, is immaterial to the justification of my claim, and I have not therefore examined this part of Clement's collection with this point in view. If it should break down when applied to these instances, this would be a very remarkable fact, and suggestions of the reason for such a state of things would then be in order. The conditions of the problem in this period are very different from those confronting us in the Golden Age. It is beyond all dispute that *neque* (*nec*), for instance, had in Silver Latin come to be regarded often as an exact equivalent of *neve* (*neu*) and could be used for it at any time and in any sort of clause. But while it is true that the types *nec feceris* and *nec facias* are freely used in Silver Latin as prohibitions, it is also true, and quite as undeniably true, that they are in Silver Latin, just as in earlier times, not infrequently used as expressions of mere contingent futurity. As instances of this latter use may be cited Tac. Germ. 14, 5 *nec tam facile persuaseris quam*, etc. ('nor would you so easily persuade,' etc.); ib. 18, 1 *severa illic matrimonia, nec ullam morum partem magis laudaveris*. In such cases *nec* with the perfect would yield no sense whatever, if treated as a prohibition; such expressions are in modal force exactly like *nec crediderim* (Tibull. III 4, 83), *nec*

*facile dixerim* (Cic. Brut. 41, 151), *neque reprehenderim* (Cic. orat. 47, 157), etc. Numerous instances might be cited also of *nec* with the present tense where the only interpretation that makes sense is the one that regards the subjunctive as one of contingent futurity, e. g. Mart. 4, 20, 3 *ferre nec hanc possis, Colline*; Stat. Silv. 10, 70, 11 *nec possis*; Tac. Ann. 6, 8 *nec adsequare*; Liv. 35, 16 *nihil aliud profecto dicatis*; and often (see Part II of my 'Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses'). It follows from these facts that, even in Silver Latin, wherever it makes as satisfactory sense to interpret such expressions as *nec putaveris* and *nec dicas* as meaning 'nor would you think,' 'nor would you say,' as it does to interpret them as prohibitions, no one can properly criticise such an interpretation as impossible. I can not see how any one has a right to say that every instance that makes good sense when interpreted as a prohibition *must* be so interpreted, and only those that can not be made to yield good sense when interpreted as prohibitions may be regarded as expressions of contingent futurity. Where either one of these interpretations makes as good sense as the other, it is in Silver Latin difficult to decide how the expressions were felt by the Romans themselves. Possibly the two sorts of expressions had by this time become somewhat confused in the Roman consciousness. Such a supposition would, at any rate, account for the remarkable extension in the use of both *non* and *nec* in Silver Latin and the inroads they are admitted to have made upon the territory of *ne* and *neve*.

In one or two details, the use of *ne* with the perfect in Silver Latin is shown by Clement to differ from that of earlier times, but my own casual observation had convinced me that such differences exist, and I called attention to them in The Latin Prohibitive (p. 326 (49)), a fact, by the way, which Clement forgets to mention. In early times it was never used in deferential address. In Silver Latin, on the other hand, it is used once in addressing the *patres conscripti* and in a few other instances where deferential address would, under ordinary circumstances, be expected. It will be noticed, however, that every such case, without exception (see Clement's own classification), is one in which failure to comply will entail a disastrous result. Even in Tac. Ann. 6, 8 (the only instance not so classified by Clement), failure to comply with the prohibition will result in the speaker's condemnation and death. When a man's life depends upon the non-performance of the act prohibited, as it does here, he can hardly be expected to retain perfect composure and observe all the forms of politeness.

It is true that the proportion of verbs of mental activity among prohibitions expressed by *ne* (*neve*) and the perfect is somewhat larger in Silver Latin than in earlier times. But this fact is not in the least unfavorable to my theory, if only these particular prohibitions are of such a sort that failure to comply with them will lead to disastrous results. And we have already seen that they are, as admitted in nearly all cases by Clement himself.

One other point should be briefly touched upon. On p. 165 Clement refers to passages in which he says the present and perfect tenses occur side by side in a way to show that no difference was felt between the tenses. Even if *ne* with the present and *ne* with the perfect did occur in these passages side by side, I can not see that it would necessarily tend to prove my theory to be false. Why is it necessary to suppose that a man can not prohibit one act with unusual energy, without using the same energy in every other prohibition uttered at about the same time? I should expect that the manner of utterance in each case would ordinarily depend upon the character of the act prohibited, as it appeared to the speaker. However, there is no such instance of the two tenses with *ne* in prohibitions in any of the passages cited by Clement. In Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 28 and 29 the first *ne*-clause is subordinate (*oro quaesoque ne deseratis*). In Tac. Ann. 6, 8, Clement thinks that *nec adsequere* is an emotional prohibition, and *ne cogitaveritis*, "the reverse." As a matter of fact, *nec adsequere* is not a prohibition at all (see above). On the other hand, *ne cogitaveritis*, as has been shown, is a prohibition of an act which, if performed, would involve as great a disaster as could well be conceived of. None of the other passages cited contains any instance of *ne* or *cave* except Curt. Ruf. 7, 8, 28 f., where *ne credideris* and *cave credas* occur in two neighboring sentences. Attention has already been called to the virtual disappearance of the perfect tense with *cave*.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

#### ELMER'S TREATMENT OF THE PROHIBITIVE—A REJOINDER.

The editor of the Journal has asked me to reply to Professor Elmer's criticism of my paper, ending the discussion of the prohibitive in these pages. The manner in which Elmer has treated my article makes it possible to discuss his original paper more incisively than the scope of my original investigation permitted.

In his original article (A. J. P. XV 326; 49<sup>1</sup>), Elmer said: "My examination of these (i. e. certain Silver Latin) authors leads me to think it probable that the principles I have laid down for classical times will, in the main, hold also for Silver Latin." This inspired my investigation. I made no attempt to prove the incorrectness of Elmer's distinction for the use of the tenses in prohibitions in the period before Livy, but only its incorrectness for the period I was considering.<sup>2</sup> As Elmer (A. J. P. XX 80, note) commended my "careful examination" of the period when I had spent only a few weeks upon it, instead of the year and a half

<sup>1</sup> The first number gives the page of the original article, the second the same page in the reprint.

<sup>2</sup> For the usage in Terence, see my paper in C. R. XV 157-159 (April, 1901).

devoted to the final paper, and as he encouraged me to continue, I can not believe that he is entirely serious in his present criticism of my method of treatment.

One of his first complaints (I shall treat them as they appear in his reply) is that I have brought other things into my discussion, beside "independent prohibitions introduced by *ne* (*neve*) and *cave*"—for example, clauses introduced by *vide ne*. Here, at the start, we have a lack of exactness in his terminology. He uses the unmodified word "prohibitions," when he ought constantly and consistently to say "independent prohibitions, together with one class of dependent prohibitions, namely those with *cave*" (for of the dependence of the subjunctive in the latter class there can be no question). Why does Elmer choose to confine himself to the dependent prohibitions introduced by *cave*? He is bound to state why the phenomena with *vide ne* are not the same as with *cave*. It will not do, as a scientific matter, to say that he chooses to confine himself to the construction with *cave*. If he can make out the case for *cave*, that fact is interesting, but he can not arrest the interest of other students of Latin at this point. One wants to know not simply what the underlying feeling of Latin usage was in independent prohibitions and dependent prohibitions with *cave*, but what the Latin feeling was in prohibitions in general.

The same holds true of the subjunctive constructions with *nec*, *nihil*, etc. The fact that Elmer regards them as belonging to a different class is no reason why others, who do not so believe, should be debarred from considering them in endeavoring to settle the general question. While he does not mention these subjunctive uses in his first paper on the prohibitive, his treatment of certain passages in that paper and in Cornell Studies, VI is so inconsistent and arbitrary that it is impossible to be certain what his real position is. I will cite a few passages as illustrations.

In the review in the present number of the Journal, he says that I discuss, among other things, "subjunctives with *nec*, *minime*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *nihil*, *numquam*, *non* and *vide*," and a little later, "in that part of the Latin Prohibitive which prompted Clement's paper . . . not a word was said by me regarding the subjunctive uses with *nec*, *nihil*, *numquam*, etc., except an emphatic statement that they lay entirely outside of my theory and had characteristics very different from those of the instances I was going to discuss." Then they are *not* prohibitive. Very good. Let us see how Elmer himself classifies some of the examples: (1) *Ne . . . quidem*. In Cic. Tusc. 1, 41, 98 *ne vos quidem mortem timueritis* is, so Elmer implies (323; 46), not a prohibition; but *ne mittas quidem* in Ter. Hec. 342 (146; 14) and *hoc . . . ne Apellae quidem dixeris* in Cic. Fam. 7, 25, 2 (150; 18) are placed by him among examples of the prohibitive. (2) *Nullus*. In Ter. Hec. 79 *nullus dixeris* is implied to be probably not prohibitive (323; 46); but *nullam severis* in Hor. Carm. 1, 18, 1 is classed (Studies, VI 26) with the prohibitives (it is plainly a translation of

Alc. fr. 44 μηδὲν φουρεύσης). (3) *Numquam*. In Plaut. Capt. 149 *numquam istuc dixis* is ruled out from the prohibitives (323; 46), but *numquam . . . quisquam . . . dixerit* in Plaut. Rud. 790 (Studies, VI 26) is counted in. (4) *Nihil*. *Nihil ignoveris*, Cic. Mur. 31, 65 (322; 45), and other examples are ruled out, but *nil fuerit*, Hor. Sat. 1, 2, 57 (Studies, VI 26), is apparently included in the prohibitives (and is so regarded by most editors). (5) *Nemo*. Elmer objects to the instance of *nemo* which I cite, *neminem riseris*, Cato, Coll. 1, 31; but in Studies, VI 26-7 he gives *dederit nemini*, Cato, Agr. 5; *nemo habessit*, Cic. Leg. 2, 8, 19; *moratus sit nemo*, Liv. 9, 11, 13; and *nemo quemquam deceperit*, Liv. 9, 11, 4; of which last example he remarks: "this is from a very impassioned speech at the time of a grave military crisis." (6) *Nec*. Elmer rules out all my examples for Silver Latin. Yet he himself (Studies, VI 26-7) has included two examples from early and classical Latin in his list—namely, *nec temptaris*, Hor. Carm. 1, 18, 2, and *nec me ille sirit Iuppiter* (for *sinit* of the MSS), Plaut. Curc. 27.<sup>1</sup>

Passing to his consideration of my examples of *ne* and *cave* with the perfect, I wish to restate a principle which he endeavors to use against me. I maintained that in prohibitions addressed to an indefinite second person (general precepts), be they perfect or present, there is no means of determining with certainty the presence or absence of emotion in a given case, for the simple reason that they *are* general. They certainly can not be counted *for* Elmer's theory; and the fairest course to pursue is to leave all of them out of consideration. Supposing, however, for the sake of argument, that one could determine the presence or absence of emotion, the presents, in fact, far exceed the perfects in number, so that in advancing this view I was aiding Elmer rather than myself. Excluding these cases, I gave three instances of non-emotional perfects. Of one of these, Phaedr. App. 26, 5, Elmer says: "*ne timueris* is merely one of several conjectures and has *not the slightest* authority of *any kind whatever*" (the italics are mine). The case would perhaps seem to call for the strong language which it evoked. But Elmer must share with me the rebuke; for in his original paper (326; 49) he himself gives the example with the same reading and without mention of its being a conjecture. Evidently we both used the Teubner text, which in its enumeration of the more important conjectures adopted makes no mention of this passage. That Tac. Ann. 6, 8 *ne cogitaveritis*, a passage whose context I carefully considered at the time, is emotional, I am not yet convinced. On the third instance, Mart. 2, 68, 3 *ne dixeris*, one should read Elmer's later comments on Auson. 296, 83 and Sen. Troad. 553, to see how he treats perfects which he wishes to retain and presents which he desires to exclude. Although Elmer (137; 5) cites Liv. 22, 39, 2

<sup>1</sup> *Sirit* here is certainly an optative, but if *nec* can be used with the optative, it is absurd to say that it can not be used with the volitive.

sis, neque . . . desis, neque . . . des, remarking: "Livy and later writers frequently use *neque* for *neve*," he admits no instance of the perfect (pp. 156-7) or present (162-3) in my paper of a similar character.

In his closing words on the perfect he evidently fails to grasp what are the two things requisite to establish the validity of his theory, and without which the theory is untenable. Not merely must the majority of the perfects be emotional, but the largest part of the presents must be the reverse. In Silver Latin the proportion of emotional perfects is much larger than in Plautus, as readers of Bennett's critique (*Studies*, IX) will recall. In Cicero's Letters Elmer himself does not claim "great earnestness, either real or assumed," for all the perfects (150; 18). Supposing all the examples I cited were clearly emotional (and even Elmer does not claim this), the theory would not be proved, if there were any considerable number of emotional presents. That this last is the case in the period discussed I am convinced, despite Elmer's efforts to remove the examples.

In my treatment of the present I made several mistakes in classification and interpretation. These are frankly to be admitted, though I am glad to say they are far less numerous than Elmer would have his readers believe. Whatever their cause, they were *not* due to hasty work; for each subjunctive passage was carefully considered at least six times, sometimes after intervals of weeks or even months.

On pages 161 and 163 I cited five instances of *nec possis* as prohibitions. The interpretation is doubtless incorrect, but when Elmer asks: "Who ever heard of such a prohibition as 'And do not be able'?", I would refer him to Giles' note on 'Latin Negatives and Their Use in Prohibitions' (*Cambridge Philological Society's Proceedings*, 1901, pp. 12-13), which Professor Gildersleeve very courteously brought to my attention. There an Oscan prohibition is given, the Latin translation of which reads as follows: *nec dicere nec fari possit*. (Giles points out that *nep*, the Oscan equivalent for *neque*, is used *only* in prohibitions.) In *Ov. Art. Am.* 1, 668 and *Ex Ponto* 2, 4, 31 *cave ne possit* occurs. *Nec adsequare*, *Tac. Ann.* 6, 8, is not a prohibition. "*Neque enim*," continues Elmer (I quoted two instances with the perfect, *Ps.-Quint.* 22, 3 and 50, 6), "is not used with a prohibitive subjunctive for the same reason that it is not used with the imperative mood." The fact that *enim* can be used with the imperative (*Ter. Eun.* 751 and *Cic. de Sen.* 19, 69 are examples) and that *nec* can be used with the imperative makes it impossible to rule out *neque enim* with the volitive.

"Another evidence of inexcusable carelessness will be noticed in Clement's free intermixture of subordinate clauses (*oro ne facias*, etc.) with prohibitions proper." As Elmer has been a serious offender in this regard, though in simpler clauses (Bennett, *Studies*, IX, pp. 51, 52, 58-60), it is interesting to get such an

unbiased opinion of his own work. I shall be obliged to refer to the original article on the prohibitive and an instance or two from Studies, VI to show Elmer's theory and practice. It will be most convenient to consider each verb separately: (1) *Obsecro*. Plaut. Amph. 924 te, Alcumena, oro, obsecro te, da mi hanc veniam, irata ne sies; Mil. 862 ne dixeritis, obsecro; Most. 1083. On page 140 (8), Elmer says: "Many of these are accompanied by expressions which betray the speaker's earnestness"; and he includes the word *obsecro*. This shows clearly that in effect he recognizes the construction with *obsecro* as prohibitive. Yet he omits Ter. H. T. 292 Syre mi, obsecro, ne me . . . conicias, and H. T. 1028, 1029 and Phorm. 945,<sup>1</sup> without a word of explanation. Again (135; 3): "the orations of Cicero alone contain 81 prohibitions (or probably twice that number, if we include such expressions as *quaeso ne facias*, *obsecro ne*, etc.)." His statement shows that he recognizes the feeling to be prohibitive in all these constructions. Why does he include some and exclude others? (2) *Obtestor*. Studies, VI 27, he cites Plaut. Capt. 320 te obtestor, ne faxint as "perhaps" dependent. On the other hand, he does not mention Ter. And. 291 te oro, . . . te obtestor, ne . . . segreges neu deseras,<sup>1</sup> and rejects Il. Lat. 724 vos . . . obtestor, ne . . . velit. And. 291 and Amph. 924 (which he accepts) are almost identical, *obtestor* in the first being represented by *obsecro* in the second. Elmer certainly would not advance the theory that clauses with *obsecro* are independent, but are not with *obtestor*. (3) *Quaeso*. Plaut. Mil. 1333 ne interveneris, quaeso (141; 9) is a prohibition; Cic. ad Att. 14, 1, 2 quaeso, ne pigrere (151; 19) "might well be explained as" among "instances of the same use" (i.e. prohibitions), and de Rep. 6, 12, 12 (136; 4), but Curt. Ruf. 9, 2, 28 oro quaesoque, ne . . . deseratis is not a prohibition. (4) *Dico*. Plaut. Trin. 501 dico, ne . . . siris is independent (the clause is plainly substantive, as I believe one of Elmer's pupils has shown [Durham, Substantive Clauses in Plautus, p. 18]), while Ter. And. 205 sed dico tibi: ne temere facias; neque haud dices tibi non praedictum; cave is omitted. Here the indicative and imperative point to the independent character of *ne facias*. (5) *Oro*. Elmer accepts an instance in Plaut. Amph. 924, cited above, and rejects instances like Expectes oro neve interimas me, Incert. 3, 273, 15, which one of our two greatest authorities on Latin syntax pronounces independent. (6) *Peto, rogo*, etc. "Next to *noli* (149; 17) the most common form of prohibition in Cicero is, I should say, some circumlocution like *peto, rogo, oro*, etc., followed by *ne* with the subjunctive, but I have made no attempt to collect the examples." Elmer cites Cic. ad Fam. 16, 9, 4 petam, ne . . . naviges as "probably independent" (it seems to me almost parallel with Sil. Ital. 17, 367, which he rejects), and excludes Apul. 19, 3 ne spernas, peto. What principles Elmer follows I can not make out. He rejects some instances where the verb precedes *ne* and the subjunctive,

<sup>1</sup> These passages are given in full, C. R. XV 158.

accepts others, and pursues the same inconsistent course when the verb follows or is thrown in parenthetically. It can not be a question of position or verb or tense, for there is no consistency in his use of any of the three. It will be seen that I have tried to follow him as faithfully as the tangle of contradictions would permit, only to be censured for my carelessness and failure to read and profit by his words.

It is clear that the grammarians are far from harmonious in their treatment of independent and dependent clauses. One phenomenon deserves more consideration than it appears to have received. From Plautus on there are numerous instances where an imperative occurs with various verbs, in the same position as subjunctive clauses with *ne*. In some instances an imperative and a *ne* prohibition are used in exact parallelism (e. g. Amph. 924). Is it not possible that all such clauses were felt as paratactic?

Curt. Ruf. 6, 3, 12 and Dracont. 5, 148, 276 are plainly subordinate. Apul. 19, 3 is a proviso (I recognized this too late to prevent the appearance of the example). All other examples of alleged subordination have, I think, been discussed.

Let us consider some of the examples of the present with *ne* and *cave*, which I regarded as emotional and where disaster would follow disregard of the prohibition. I will take up only a few representative cases as illustrative of the whole.—Pers. 3, 96. It is true that the friend's help may save the invalid's life. Many invalids, however, regard any interference with them as a distinct injury to their feelings or interests, and often express themselves vigorously.—Stat. Theb. 3, 243. Elmer objects to my reading *pugnare* for *pugnate*. It does not change in any way the prohibition *ne certetis*.—Stat. Silv. 4, 9, 55; Mart. 11, 102, 7, and Apul. 30, 6 (the last two with *cave*) are in a spirit of fun. One can employ vigorous expressions or a vigorous tone even in jest.—Vespa 62. The loss of a debate is often regarded and felt as a disaster.—Apul. 146, 3. Not to be recognized, as a noted robber would doubtless be a serious shock to a bandit chief's feelings.—Curt. Ruf. 4, 1, 22. Should a poor man, suddenly raised to power, forget his humble origin, his reign would in all probability be tyrannical.—Curt. Ruf. 4, 10, 26. Darius urges a messenger not to spare him. Failure to comply with the prohibition would at first sight seem a kindness, but he shows it would not be by adding: "it is often a solace in calamity to know your fate."—Stat. Theb. 11, 111 is certainly emotional. (Elmer, having cited the only instance in Plautus (Men. 994) of *cave* with the third person of the perfect, seems to shun all other instances of the first and third persons with *cave* as religiously as those of *nec*. They certainly should receive the same consideration.) There are various other examples, but as Elmer has not attacked them, it is not necessary to defend them. It has been shown conclusively, I think, that, confining the investigation to the lines Elmer would insist on (*ne* with the subjunctive and *cave* with the subjunctive), that there is a large proportion of emotional presents.

The most trifling objection Elmer urges against my treatment is to be found in his criticism of the examples given on page 165 of my paper of the disasters resulting from non-compliance with the prohibitions: "one has to search for them, as citations are omitted." All the passages referred to were given on the three pages preceding, properly labelled. One appreciates the full value of the criticism when he discovers that, owing to omissions and the absence of citations, he must read over 8000 pages of Teubner text to secure the examples of *cave* in the period Elmer claims to cover.

If it be true, as Elmer admits, that "the types *nec feceris* and *nec facias* are freely used in Silver Latin in prohibitions," why he should be unwilling to consider examples of such usage is a mystery. It is interesting in connection with his statement: "It is beyond all dispute that *neque* (*nec*) had in Silver Latin come to be regarded often as an exact equivalent of *neve* (*neu*)" to read Giles' note, in which he shows that, in Oscan *ne p*, the equivalent of Latin *neque*, is used only in prohibitions, and "the form with *-que*, therefore, is not an usurper in the territory of *neve*; *neve* itself is the usurper." That being the case, what becomes of the subjunctive of obligation or propriety with *nec*?

I am perfectly willing to admit that there are instances in Silver Latin where the perfect or the present with *nec* can not be translated as a prohibition. The instances which Elmer cites I treated as he did. On the other hand, I do not see why, when subjunctives with *nec* make perfectly good sense as prohibitions, they should be regarded as anything else, especially since a number of them follow a subjunctive with *ne* or an imperative.

To lists previously given where the present and perfect occur side by side should be added Plaut. Trin. 1011, 1012 *Cave ne crepent*; *ne destiteris*; Cic. Att. 10, 13, 1 (150; 18) *ne demiseris*: *pertimescas cave*, and Prop. 1, 10, 20, 23, 24 *Cave ne capias, neu negaris, neu cadant*.

To Elmer's "complete" list of perfects in Cicero's Letters (150; 18) should be added Quint. Frat. 2, 5, 3 *ne omiseris*.

It will be admitted, without citations from Elmer's original article, that the use of dependent prohibitions introduced by *cave* was one of the two parts of the theory which he aimed to establish for the period prior to Livy. It will also be admitted by all scholars that it is absolutely essential for the demonstration of any theory's validity that *all* the examples of the usage within the period covered be collected, that the citations be given, and that the instances be properly classified so that any one desiring to test the theory for himself can do so with comparative ease. Elmer's frequent references to *cave* led me to compare the statistics he gives with my own collections. The following table will best present the results:

		Instances said to occur.	Actual number.	Passages cited.	Text cited.	Omissions.
Plaut.,	Perf.	29	33	29	0	4
	Pres.	9	18	9	0	9
Ter.,	Perf.	4	4	4	0	0
	Pres.	5	9	5	0	4
Cato,	Pres.	17	17	1	1	0
Catull.,	Pres.	0	3	0	0	3
Cicero,	Pres.	30	32	17	1	2
Sallust.,	Pres.	1	1	0	0	0
Nepos,	Pres.	1	1	0	0	0
Horace,	Perf.	0	1	0	0	1
	Pres.	0	6	0	0	6
Vergil,	Pres.	0	1	0	0	1
Tibull.,	Pres.	0	6	0	0	6
Prop.,	Perf.	0	2	0	0	2
	Pres.	0	5	0	0	5
Ovid,	Perf.	0	1	0	0	1
	Pres.	0	16	0	0	16
		—	—	—	—	—
		96	156	64	2	60

Elmer says (142; 10) there are 18 (19?) examples of the present in Plautus and Terence, but (146; 14) cites only the number given above. It will be seen that even my statistics are incomplete, as I have noted only the instances met with in my reading since my interest in the subject was aroused. A number of authors are missing, while for Cicero my collections are only for the Letters. Others may be able to extend the list still farther.<sup>1</sup> I give a list of the omissions (except the Plautine perfects, on which see Bennett, *Studies*, VI 57), which may prove serviceable for reference, verbs other than those of the second person being indicated in parentheses, thus (1), (3): Plaut. *Aul.* 660 (1); *Bacch.* 1033 (3); *Curc.* 461 (3); *Most.* 324, 326; *Pseud.* 1296 (1); *Rud.* 704; *Stich.* 38 (1); *Trin.* 1011 (3); *Ter. And.* 403 (3); *H. T.* 1031 (1), 1032 (1); *Phor.* 764 (3); *Catull.* 50, 18, 19; 61, 152; *Cic. Att.* 1, 10, 4; 1, 11, 3; 13, 33, a. 1; *Fam.* 5, 20, 6; 6, 12, 5; 10, 5, 3; 10, 12, 1; 16, 12, 6 (bis); *Hor. Sat.* 2, 3, 38; 2, 3, 177 (bis); 2, 5, 75 (3); *Ep.* 1, 6, 32 (3); 1, 13, 19 (bis); *Verg. Aen.* 11, 293 (3); *Tibull.* 1, 6, 17 (3), 18 (3), 19 (3), 20 (bis) (3); 4, 2, 3 (3); *Prop.* 1, 7, 25; 1, 10, 20, 23, 24 (3); 3 (2), 13, 41; 5 (4), 8, 77, 78 (3); *Ov. Am.* 1, 8, 72 (3), 95 (3); *Art. Am.* 1, 667 (3), 668 (3); 3, 237, 801; *Rem. Am.* 689, 717; *Metam.* 2, 89 (1); *Trist.* 1, 1, 25, 104; 5, 13, 26; *Ex Ponto* 1, 9, 32 (3); 2, 4, 31 (3); 2, 8, 64 (3); *Fast.* 1, 58, 684 (3). Elmer says in his criticism that he knows of no instance of *cave* with the perfect after Terence, except *Hor. Sat.* 2, 3, 38 and *Curt. Ruf.* 5, 2, 21. He will find three

<sup>1</sup> Thus Ribbeck, in the indices of his *Scenic Fragments*, gives eight additional examples, all presents but one.

more instances in the above list: Prop. 1, 10, 23; 3 (2), 13, 41; Ov. ex Ponto 1, 9, 32.

From the foregoing it will be seen that there are 41 perfects as compared with 115 presents; 37 of these perfects (90 per cent.) occur in Plautus and Terence; from Terence on the proportion of perfects to presents is 4 to 88, or about 4 per cent.; to prove Elmer's theory the large majority of these presents must be non-emotional. What had become of Roman emotion after Terence?

From Plautus on, *cave* with the present is often used in expressions of emotion, more or less strong, thus (I cite only a few typical cases, as I have neither desire nor space for an extended discussion): Plaut. Capt. 439; Most. 324; Ter. H. T. 1031; Phor. 793; Catull. 61, 152; Cic. Att. 1, 10, 4; Tibull. 4, 2, 3; Prop. 1, 10, 24; Ov. Met. 2, 89; Sall. Cat. 59. In Plautus fully one fourth of the examples are emotional, in Terence nearly every instance.<sup>1</sup> In later authors the proportion varies, averaging probably 40 per cent. to 60 per cent. Thus, without 40 per cent. of the examples of the usage which he claims to discuss, without an adequate statement or exposition of the instances in even the three authors upon whom he apparently bases his discussion, Elmer asserts the validity of a theory which is not even tenable in the authors where the percentage of perfects is the highest. That he ventured to advance a theory so important without an adequate basis of statistics, and practically without any argument in its support, seems almost incredible. It is a mystery why its utter weakness was not discovered at once.

The same omissions occur in his treatment of *ne* with the present subjunctive, only the instances in Plautus, Terence and Cicero being given; but in this case, like Elmer, "I have made no attempt to collect the examples." Thus only one of the four divisions of his theme (*ne* with the perfect subjunctive) has been adequately treated.

On pages 149-150 (17-18) Elmer presents some statistics as to the use of different forms of prohibition in Cicero's Letters which are certainly interesting. After mentioning the recipients of the letters where *ne* with the perfect was used—Atticus, Quintus Cicero, Trebatius, and Fadius Gallus—he says: "To his other correspondents he uses *noli* or in two instances *cave* with the present subjunctive." But Cicero has *eleven* examples of *cave* outside of the letters to Atticus, *seven* of which certainly are to persons other than those whom Elmer mentions: to Rufus (Fam. 5, 20, 6), Ampius (Fam. 6, 12, 5), Paetus (Fam. 9, 24, 4), Plancus (Fam. 10, 5, 3; 10, 12, 1), Tiro (Fam. 16, 12, 6). A little later Elmer states: "Except the passionate remonstrance referred to in a letter written by Brutus (Brut. 1, 16, 6), the correspondents of Cicero use only *noli* in addressing him." But Balbus (Att. 8, 15, a. 2) uses *cave*, and Caelius (Fam. 8, 16, 2) and Brutus (Fam. 11, 20, 3 and Brut. 1, 16, 7) use *vide*.

<sup>1</sup> See C. R. XV 158.

In my 'Prohibitives in Silver Latin' (A. J. P. XXI 166), I remarked: "it is interesting to note that the critics and later writers on the prohibitive regard Professor Elmer as the original overthrower of Madvig's theory, either ignorant or forgetful of the fact that Professor Hale (A. J. P. IX 162) six years before the appearance of Elmer's papers had shown that Madvig's theory did not apply to Plautus." I am rather surprised to see that Elmer takes no notice of this remark. The case becomes still more striking in view of the complete parallelism between Hale's statement of the force of the perfect subjunctive (pp. 161 and 162) and that of Elmer in several places. Thus, in the year 1888 (op. cit.), Hale, laying down the general distinction between the present subjunctive and the perfect, says: "the feeling of the finished tense in the independent jussive is that of peremptoriness. The speaker, using it, expresses himself with a certain amount of authoritative impatience"; . . . "the *be-it-done-and-done-with* perfect"; while Elmer, in the year 1898 (Studies, VI 16), says: "in my papers on the Latin Prohibitive (A. J. P. XV, 1894) I have shown that the only important distinction to be made between the two tenses is that the perfect tense is impatient and emotional, while the present tense is common-place." It was in immediate connection with his statement as given above that Hale said (in clear opposition, so far as the ground covered by the statement is concerned, to the dominant theory of Madvig): "Plautus freely uses the present subjunctive in prohibitions addressed to a particular person." If such a phrase of censure as Elmer's "inexcusable carelessness" is to be used at all in philological discussion, it certainly might be charitably employed of Elmer's silence in this matter. In the passages quoted above Hale had supplied all the elements for an investigation of Madvig's doctrine, which it looked as if he had begun upon himself.

It will be noted that, in the foregoing, every reference to Elmer's original paper has been by page, often verbatim, when the accuracy of such reference could otherwise be disputed. I hope I have made every point of my position plain, frankly acknowledged every mistake, and shown some small part at least of the weaknesses, inconsistencies, omissions and mistakes in Elmer's treatment of the prohibitive. With these before him for consideration, I trust his criticisms of others in the future will be tempered by more of the spirit of comity and fair play than has characterized them in the past.

WILLARD K. CLEMENT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EVANSTON, ILL.

## REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, herausgegeben von EUGEN KÖLBING.  
XXV. Band, 1898.

I.—A. Schade, On the relation of Pope's January and May and The Wife of Bath to the corresponding portions of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. By way of preface the testimony of Pope himself is cited to show that his estimate of Chaucer as a poet varied from time to time, and was never high. Then follows a discussion of the origin and history of the story told by Chaucer's merchant—chiefly a résumé of studies by Varnhagen and others, with some criticism of minor points in their work. Schade favors the theory that Chaucer was indebted, at least for the episode of the pear-tree, to a fabliau no longer extant. Pope's January and May is simply one of his youthful exercises in adaptation. Conclusive evidence shows that he used the text of Chaucer printed in 1687. By a laborious process of comparison, which deals not only with Pope's omissions, additions, and alterations in relating the story, but also with differences in syntax and metre between the two versions, Schade arrives at results that are instructive, though quite easily anticipated. Pope in adapting the tale to his own times suppresses none of its indecency. He is less outspoken, to be sure, but the euphemisms with which his obscenity is covered are both suggestive and vicious. He is on the whole less concrete and picturesque than Chaucer. While Chaucer betrays some sympathy and tenderness of regard for the aged victim of a mean intrigue, and at times even appreciates the tragic aspect of his plight, Pope only sneers at his discomfiture. "With Pope the thought without its embellishment is nought," says the author. "With Chaucer it is nearly everything: the latter stands for Nature, the former for Art." This opinion seems to be rather the conventional than the correct one. Even the present study affords some help to a deeper appreciation of Chaucer's exquisite art. Incidentally Schade deals with the influence of other English poets, chiefly Dryden, upon Pope's early style. The article is continued in volume XXVI.

E. Kölbing, Ten Byroniana, with notes. Among other letters are here printed several of Byron's written from various localities abroad to Hanson, his banker, showing something of the condition of his estate in the years 1809-1811; a letter from his mother to Hanson, written three weeks before her death, revealing great distress over financial matters; a letter from Byron to Mme. de

Staël in 1816, protesting that the reconciliation between him and Lady Byron which she had endeavored to effect was impossible.

H. Klinghardt, *The Value of Phonetics in Teaching the Mother-tongue and Foreign Languages*. This article reports the discussion which followed a paper on the value of phonetics in elementary teaching of modern languages, read by O. Jespersen before the Association of Danish Grammar Schools. A full report of the paper was given in the preceding volume of *Englische Studien*. Among other opinions expressed were the following: The utility of the phonetic method in teaching the native language would vary widely in different countries. The use of a phonetic alphabet in teaching English, for example, valuable as it might be in acquiring a correct pronunciation, encourages incorrect spelling. The first aim in studying a foreign language should be to gain access to its literature. The practical advantage that lies in the power to speak a language should always be of secondary importance. The phonetic method, however, makes this latter its chief object. On the other hand, it is shown that by this method the usual difficulties have been mastered as easily as by any other, with the added advantage of a correct pronunciation. The value of the phonetic method is not great enough to warrant the introduction of a phonetic alphabet and the study of the speech-organs. Its virtue lies in requiring the teacher to correct the mistakes in pronunciation which, under the old method, escaped his notice.

II.—K. Horst, *Contribution to the Study of the Old English Annals*. The author continues from the preceding volume his classification of MSS.

H. B. Baildon, Robert Louis Stevenson. This article, compiled in part from the *Dictionary of National Biography*, is intended primarily for German readers, but contains matter which must be interesting to those among whom Stevenson is better known than he is on the Continent. Baildon was his intimate friend when both were boys at Dr. Thompson's school in Edinburgh, and the attachment continued to the end of Stevenson's life. The writer has noticed several parallels between the youthful experiences of his friend and those of Goethe, especially his attempt to practice law, and his difference with his parents in choosing a career. A similar case, not mentioned by the author, is that of Carlyle. The French qualities of Stevenson's style have for some time been apparent to many. In school, though he was not studious, he had a distinct preference for French, Geometry, and Latin, but never did much with Greek. The writer says: "Some of the care and finish of his style and its frequent felicities may be traced back to his early love for Cicero and Horace, Ovid and Virgil." And again, Stevenson is styled "a prose Horace, for to Horace has been attributed the quality of a *curiosa felicitas*, and



III.—O. Bischoff, *On the Disyllabic Thesis and the Epic Caesura in Chaucer*. The author's chief inquiry may be stated thus: In Chaucer's heroic verse (ten syllables, five stresses), where the caesura would ordinarily occur between two unstressed syllables (the so-called epic caesura), ought it to be observed by a pause, or be avoided by slurring or elision? In volume XXIV Bischoff found that in all parts of the verse, except at the caesura, the poet certainly preferred syncope or elision to a thesis of two syllables. By a detailed examination of all possible cases of the epic caesura in Chaucer's heroic verses he now discovers that out of more than 4400, above 4300 will admit of syncope or elision, and this therefore indicates Chaucer's method of reading them. He then proceeds to discuss the usage in this respect not only of the poet's predecessors and models in English and French, but of his successors as well, and in the course of his discussion to refute the adverse views of Schipper and Skeat. The investigation is painstaking to the last degree, but seems after all like the defense of a prejudice. The author is too much occupied with details to regard the fact that the apparent irregularity in Chaucer which he tries to explain away is not an irregularity, but a characteristic of English metre from *Beowulf* to the present. The variation in length of unstressed intervals, and the wide variations in degrees of stress within a single line, are among the most important sources of beauty and vigor in English verse.

M. S. Leather, *Pope as a Student of Milton*. The influence of Milton over Pope—apparent in nearly all the works of the latter—is an influence rather of style than of thought. Both the early and the late poems of Milton were closely studied by Pope, and his chief model of style in translating the *Iliad* was *Paradise Lost*. In her discussion of *Satires of Donne*, IV 186:

Where Contemplation prunes her ruffled wings,

the author might have added *L'Allegro* 6:

Where brooding Darkness spreads his jealous wings.

J. Ellinger, *On the Linguistic Interpretation of English Prose Texts in the Higher Schools*. An attempt to define the proper extent and limit of such interpretation.

Reviews.—A second edition of Kluge's *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch* is recommended both for work in the class-room and for private study.—G. Binz criticizes Lindelöf's glossary of the Rushworth Gospels for the omission of indexes, and for the failure to provide the context of the words glossed.—Spies's *Studien zur Geschichte des englischen Pronomens im XV. und XVI. Jahrhundert* is said by Franz to be an important contribution to the study of syntax during early modern period.—Conrad's theory, set forth in his book on Shakespeare's *Selbstbekenntnisse*, that the poet not only addressed his sonnets to the Earl of Essex, but

made him the original of the character of Hamlet, is disputed by Sarrazin, who enumerates his objections.—Lindner and Bobertag discuss respectively R. Fürst's *Die Vorläufer der modernen Novelle im XVIII. Jahrhundert*, and C. H. Clarke's *Fielding und der deutsche Sturm und Drang*.—Swaen speaks of D. Schmid's study of Congreve, *sein Leben und seine Lustspiele* as one of the best books on this dramatist. Dametz's similar study of Vanbrugh is not up to date. Both works appear as *Wiener Beiträge*. The reviewer calls attention to several subjects under the general head of the Restoration Drama which urge the attention of scholars.

In the *Miscellanea W. von Wurzbach* compares Byron's *Parisina* with earlier versions of the story by Bandello and Lope de Vega, and with the historical events in Ferrara upon which they are based. With these accounts Byron was not acquainted, but founded his narrative upon a brief recital in Gibbon's *Antiquities of the House of Brunswick*.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD.

## ROMANIA, Vol. XXVII (1898).

Janvier.

F. Lot. *Gormond et Isembard : recherches sur les fondements historiques de cette épopée*. 54 pages. I. Le Roi Louis. II. Isembard. III. Gormond. IV. Huelin. V. Personnages épiques ; Date de la composition du fragment de Bruxelles ; Conclusions. The conclusions reached are that : 1. the epic *Gormond et Isembard* is founded on the battle of Saucourt in 881, and Louis III is the king referred to ; 2. *Gormond* himself is a fusion of the characters of the vikings *Vurm* and *Guthorm* ; 3. *Isembard* must have been an obscure baron of Pontieu who joined the Norsemen about the end of the ninth century ; 4. *Huelin* can not be identified ; and 5. the poem itself was composed in Pontieu between the years 1060 and 1070.

A. Piaget. *Le Chapel des Fleurs de Lis par Philippe de Vitri*. 38 pages. Publication of the text with an introduction.

P. Meyer. *La traduction provençale de la légende dorée*. 45 pages. A comparative study with two facsimiles of the manuscripts, which are divided into three groups of successive development. The eighty-four legends are each treated separately.

F. Novati. *Poesie musicali francesi de' sec. XIV e XV tratte da mss. italiani*.

Mélanges. A. Mussafia. *Enclisi o proclisi del pronome personale atono qual oggetto*.—Em. Walberg. *Est : me(s)t*.—A. Jeanroy. *Une imitation d'Albert de Sisteron par Mahieu le Juif*.

Comptes rendus. Miscellanea nuziale Rossi-Teiss (G. Paris).—Theodor Maxeiner, Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Wörter im Mittelhochdeutschen (F. Piquet).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXI 4, numerous etymologies discussed (G. Paris).—Giornale Dantesco IV, synopsis of articles (Paget Toynbee).

Chronique. Items of interest, especially concerning the *Société des anciens textes français*, the *Revue des traditions populaires*, and M. Brunetière's *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française*.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 12 titles. O. Densusianu, La Prise de Cordres et de Seville. "Nous espérons que le jeune philologue, actuellement professeur à l'université de Bucarest, répandra dans sa patrie le goût et la méthode de la philologie française."

Avril.

E. G. Parodi. Del passaggio di V in B e di certe perturbazioni delle leggi fonetiche nel Latino Volgare. I. 64 pages.—C. Voretzsch. Sur Anseis de Cartage: Supplément de l'édition de M. Alton. II. Le roman en prose. III. Le translateur. 29 pages.—L. Gauchat. Encore Manducatum = Manducatam. 17 pages.

Mélanges. E. Galtier; J. D. M. Ford; A. Mussafia (*ter*).

Comptes rendus. Carl Voretzsch. Das Merovingerepos und die fränkische Heldensage (H. Yvon).—Mémoires de la Société néo-philologique à Helsingfors (G. Paris).—Mathias Friedwagner. Meraugis von Portlesgueuz (G. Paris). 111 pages.—L. Vuilhorgne. Raoul de Houdenc, sa vie et ses œuvres (M. Friedwagner).—Child Memorial Volume (G. Paris): E. S. Sheldon, On Anglo-French and Middle English *au* for French *a* before a Nasal; Ph. B. Marcou, The French Historical Infinitive; G. L. Kittredge, Who was Sir Thomas Malory? R. Weeks, The Messenger in Aliscans; H. Schofield, The Lay of Guingamor. "Nous voyons avec plaisir M. Schofield continuer sur notre ancienne littérature poétique les recherches qu'il a si bien inaugurées, et en général les études de philologie romane prendre pied aux États-Unis comme elles commencent à le faire depuis quelques années."—Schwan-Behrens, Grammatik des Altfranzösischen (Mario Roques).—Victor Chauvin. Pacolet et les Mille et une Nuits (G. Paris).

Chronique. Death of M. Jean Passy. "C'est là qu'il composa, en collaboration avec M. Alfred Rambeau, professeur à Baltimore, une *Chrestomathie française* avec la prononciation figurée, à l'usage des étrangers (Paris et New-York, 1897), que précède une introduction, riche en idées et en faits, sur la méthode

phonétique."—Controversy between Profs. Fr. Hanssen and E. Porebovicz.—"*Créole*. Poyen-Bellisle (254-260)," in *Krit. Jahresbericht*, t. II.—"M. A. Matzke, reprenant un projet qu'avait jadis formé M. Jos. Herz, a l'intention de publier les deux poèmes de Simon de Fresne, le *Roman de Philosophie* et la *Vie de saint Georges*."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 19 titles.

Juillet.

P. Meyer. Documents linguistiques des Basses-Alpes. 105 pages. "J'ai commencé de bonne heure—en fait, depuis ma première année d'École des chartes, il y a quarante ans—à recueillir et à classer, selon un ordre à la fois géographique et chronologique, des textes de langue provençale." "Si je parviens à faire pour trente-cinq départements ce que je viens de faire pour les Basses-Alpes, la philologie provençale reposera sur une base solide."

P. Savj-Lopez. Il Filostrato di G. Boccaccio. 28 pages. "Così per un certo rispetto può dirsi, che il *Filostrato* dove pure non sono cavalieri giostranti e viaggi d'avventura e miracoli d'incantamenti, sia fra' primi poemi della letteratura italiana che innalzino alla suprema dignità dell' arte la materia cavalleresca."

Mélanges. Fr. Wulff; Gaston Paris (*bis*).

Comptes rendus. Alfred Jeanroy et Henri Guy, Chanson et dits artésiens du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (G. Paris). 19 pages.

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXII 2, numerous etymologies discussed (G. Paris).—Giornale storico della Lett. Ital. XXVII, XXVIII, list of contents (P. Meyer).—Bulletin de la Soc. des anciens textes franç. 1897.

Chronique. Death of M. Auguste Brachet, known for his *Grammaire historique de la langue française*.—Appreciative notice of long list of works by M. Paul Meyer.—Account by M. A. Morel-Fatio of the investigations of the *Poema del Cid* by Profs. J. Cornu, Ed. Lidforss, A. M. Huntington, and Fernando Araujo.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 16 titles. Works concerning Marie de France (K. Warnke), Lope de Vega (A. Ludwig), Geoffrey Chaucer (A. W. Pollard, etc.), Alfonso el Sabio (E. Cotarelo y Morí), etc.

Octobre.

F. Lot. Nouvelles études sur la provenance du Cycle Arthuriens. I. Glastonbury et Avalon. 45 pages. This article is noteworthy for the unusual extent of its footnotes, to which in many instances the main text serves as a mere framework.

G. Mazzoni, A. Jeanroy. Un nouveau manuscrit du Roman de Troie et de l'Histoire ancienne avant César. 8 pages. The

manuscript in question belonged to Sig. Grigolli of Desenzano, in the province of Brescia, and has recently been acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale of Paris. The manuscript and Old French text are both in poor condition.

A. Piaget. *Le Chemin de Vaillance de Jean de Courcy et l'hiatus de l'e final des polysyllabes aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles.* 26 pages. This tedious poem of forty thousand verses is modeled upon the *Roman de la Rose* and similar works.

Comptes rendus. Wilhelm Röttiger, *Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung* (Ernest Muret). 12 pages. "Parmi la foule des récits divergents qui étaient colportés en Angleterre et sur le continent par des conteurs en prose, les deux principales versions de la légende de Tristan se seraient constituées par les préférences de deux éminents poètes. L'œuvre de Thomas était peut-être plus belle, mais celle de Chrétien semble être plus ancienne en date. Aussi bien que le roi Arthur et les compagnons de la Table Ronde, que le Chevalier au Lionnet Perceval, que Lancelot et Guenièvre, Tristan et Iseut ont probablement été introduits dans la littérature française et européenne par le célèbre poète champenois. Si Thomas était une âme plus poétique, plus sensible et plus profonde, nous reconnaissons toujours mieux en Chrétien de Troyes l'un de ces heureux génies qui ont su révéler aux autres hommes des sources cachées de joie et d'émotion."—Alfred Linder, *Plainte de la Vierge en vieux vénitien* (Alfred Pillet).—Gustave Maccon, *Note sur le mystère de la résurrection attribué à Jean Michel* (G. Paris).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.* XXII 3, summary of contents and discussion of etymologies (G. Paris).—*Revue de philologie franç. et prov.* IX, X, XI, summary of contents.

Chronique. *Festschrift zum VIII. allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentage*, verfasst von Mitgliedern der österreichischen Universitäten und des Wiener neuphilologischen Vereines, herausgegeben von J. Schipper. Contains a number of articles of interest to Romance scholars.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 3 titles. Franz Xaver Kraus, *Dante: Sein Leben und sein Werk, sein Verhältniss zur Kunst und Politik.*

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

### BRIEF MENTION.

Translation is a fertile theme; for the problems it involves are as numberless as the phenomena of language. And they are problems that no practical teacher can escape. I venture to say that any one who has been engaged in the work of giving instruction in any language could write out of his own experience essay after essay on the different ways of making bad translations, with ample illustrations from the performances of his pupils, and, if he would be candid, from his own. The positive side of the art is far more difficult, but there is no lack of tractates by which scholars have vainly endeavored to impart correct principles. Tycho Mommsen's book was reviewed in this Journal fourteen years ago (VIII 231), and mention was made of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's brilliant essay on the same theme (XIII 517), and now CAUER'S *Die Kunst des Uebersetzens* has been found so suggestive by Professor TOLMAN that he has been prompted to put forth a slender volume of some 80 pages on *The Art of Translating* (Sanborn), which follows the lines of Cauer's book. It is not a translation of Cauer's book, for that would be absurd on the face of it. True, there is a body of doctrine that abides on account of the modern character of both English and German, but the difference between the two languages over against Latin and Greek is very great, although it has not been taken into account sufficiently by those who translate German manuals into English.

---

In the hands of a master the German language, as is well known, lends itself to translation much more readily than English, not simply because of its various virtues on which I need not expatiate, but because of its comparative freedom from reminiscential phraseology. Into the text of our literary language have been woven threads from five hundred years of continuous tissue; and despite the 'decay of literary allusion' over which great lamentation has been made of late, no one can write English like a native without enriching his discourse with the filaments of earlier fabrics, distinctly the products of individual looms. Now, a language that is stiffened with such embroidery is hard to translate from, because so much is lost; it is hard to translate into, because it can not wrap itself so closely round a foreign original as a language which, if one excepts Luther's Bible—to which our Authorized Version is more than an offset—has only a century and a half of phrase-makers to supply the fibre. However that may be, the temptation of the

ready-made locution is ever present in English, and, the worst of it is, that to yield to the seduction is to earn applause. The judicious may be supposed to grieve. But the judges are bribed. There is no one to protest against the incongruity. There is no one to consider the warning which Frere gives in his review of Mitchell's Aristophanes. Theoretically the translation ought to be achromatic. It may be nothing but an etching, but, in the name of the Muses, do not color an etching. Now, some of the translations that Professor TOLMAN admires are of this very reminiscential order, and, as Professor Shorey says in his memorable review of Jowett's Plato (XIII 351), a distinct charm of that much lauded performance is the interweaving of familiar quotations and literary allusions. But there is really no defence of these *dulcia vitia*. Vergil and Tennyson are near akin, and when the eagle 'clasps the crag with hooked hands' there is a certain satisfaction in recalling Palinurus, 'prensantem uncis manibus capita aspera montis'; but it ought not to work the other way, and yet when Professor Tyrrell translates Ennius' famous line: *Moribus antiquis stat res Romana virisque* by

*Broad-based* upon her men and principles  
Standeth the state of Rome,

Professor TOLMAN applauds the Tennysonianism. When Walter Savage Landor puts into the mouth of one of his Greek characters the Ovidian reminiscence 'rude and undigested mass,' one is tempted to cry out: 'A gross anachronism!' Not more so than 'broad-based' in translating Ennius. And yet, who can withstand the temptation to applaud despite the incongruous association of Republican Rome with Constitutional Victoria? My own sins in this line are ever before me, but 'You're another' has lost its terrors for me, and when Dr. HEMPHILL translates Persius, II 71 *magna lance* by 'lordly dish,' I object to the association of Sisera with Messalla, just as if my own diction were not penetrated with the Biblical phraseology on which I was nurtured. In my edition of Persius—a task to which I was impelled not so much by my admiration of that poet, as by the *ingeni largitor*, which is responsible for so much of my published work—I have frequently found myself obliged to comment on the false picturesqueness of Conington's version, who has often overdone what was already overdone; and yet I have laid myself open to another charge. Persius is the most reminiscential of all poets, and therefore I ventured to sow reminiscences of English poetry up and down my summaries, which are often half translations. But Persius' range of reminiscences was very narrow, and I ought to have kept myself mainly to Pope, who would have been a manner of analogue to Horace; but I did not conceive my task in so purely artistic a spirit, though I am very glad that I haven't it to do over again, and it is very much more pleasant to study the results that have been reached by others. So, for instance, a comparison of Dr. HEMP-

HILL's *Translation of Persius* (London, George Bell) with that of Conington can not fail to interest and instruct any student of that 'crabbed coxcomb,' as a character in Ben Jonson calls the youthful satirist 'who will come after the king?' True, Conington has been considered one of the kings of the translating world, and the old question recurs, 'who will come after the king?'; and yet, though Dr. HEMPHILL has been under Conington's influence to some extent and has followed him at points about which I have taken the pains to protest, still his careful and spirited version is a distinct addition to our apparatus and his introduction has gone far to reconcile me to the memory of the year that I spent in the company of an uncongenial prig, whom I have liked better since I have not been obliged to live with him.

---

A word more on this interminable subject of translations. The reproduction of the effect of the style has its limits. Professor TOLMAN says: 'Don't make the translation more elegant than the original.' But if the style of the original is perverse or awkward, it falls outside of the artistic category, and the original is not worth translating except for the contents. Who but Professor Tolman would find fault with Mr. Frazer for not reproducing what I have called the string-halt of Pausanias' style? Who would blame Dr. White for not giving us painful parallels to Appian's diction? Take Xenophon. Xenophon is not a Pausanias, nor an Appian; he is a classic, and whatever faults modern Hellenists have found with his language, an old Greek writer, on rhetoric—Aristeides or another—has left us an elaborate study of his style as a model of artistic ἀφελεια. Such a style, then, might challenge artistic reproduction. And yet Mr. Dakyns in his admirable version has not undertaken to bring out consistently the American tang which he has discovered in the honey of the Attic bee. There are cases in which one is privileged to improve on the original. Swinburne has said that Byron is much better reading in French prose than in the original English verse, and Swinburne, by his own command of poetic rhythm, has earned a right to quarrel with the original and to enjoy the translation. Let us read Amyot's Plutarch and North's Plutarch without asking whether they are not better than the original. And let us remember that there is a serious side to this hyperaesthetism. How much fewer fastidious souls would have been saved, if the Greek of the New Testament had not been transposed into the organ notes of the Authorized Version. Only the robust sort can forgive εἰς with the indicative and associate with the riff-raff of worse than plebeian names that figure in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

Persius seems to haunt this batch of *Brief Mention*. In reading a recent edition of Juvenal I was struck by the scant mention of a satirist to whom Juvenal may indeed have owed little, but who, for all that, furnishes apt illustrations to Juvenal's text. In my boyhood both Persius and Juvenal were read *ante pilos*, at an age when many youngsters of to-day are still wrestling with the *Bellum Gallicum*, and while our vision may have been vague, some of the moral lessons did not fail to strike deep, and I did not have to wait until I became an editor of Persius to learn the moral of

usque adeone  
Scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?

and many a formula picked up in reading or gained by observation had become part of my being before I thought fit to put it in print. The philological world, especially the grammatical section of it, is full of claimants, some of them Roger Tichborne claimants, some of them unfamiliar with the records of research. In his very readable *Grammatica Militans*, PAUL CAUER (p. 15) attributes to Kern the formula of the Accusative of the Object Affected and of the Object Effected. Where I got it from I do not remember, but Object Affected and Object Effected figure in my Latin Grammar of 1867. The same scholar records his pleasure at the cleverness of a young boy who, instead of giving the current whence-case explanation of the than-ablative with the comparative, called the said ablative an instrumental. Was the boy really clever or had he been reading an old copy of Madvig? "Der Ablativ scheint eigentlich zu bezeichnen dass der höhere Grad durch das Andere, welches mit zum Vergleiche gezogen wird, zum Vorschein kommt" (Madvig, §271. Anm.). To think that the doctrines of such a light as Madvig should have already fallen into the thick darkness of oblivion! To a survivor like myself these rediscoveries are a perpetual source of amusement.

---

How any one born to the English language or furnished with a decent knowledge of Greek, even if unacquainted with Krüger (43, 3, 6), should ever have interpreted *εἰς διδασκάλου* as an ellipsis for *εἰς διδασκάλου οἶκον* (leg. *οἶκον*) has been a matter of amused wonder to me for fifty years. Tom's is Tom's house or Tom's shop or Tom's barroom, Tom's characteristic locality. So *ἐν διδασκάλου*, so *ἐκ διδασκάλου*. Cf. Ar. Pl. 84: *ἐκ Πατροκλέους ἔρχομαι*. The genitive depends on the idea of locality contained in the local adverb. There is no ellipsis whatever, though, to be sure, it is more common to use *παρά* of the characteristic locality with the appropriate case. It is to me an old story. Imagine, then, my surprise to find in a recent number of the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (Dec. 19, 1900) that Herr MEISTER claims this as his discovery and points triumphantly to his *Griech*.

*Dialekte*, Bd. II, S. 298, where the subject is treated at length. The extension of the principle on which *εἰς διδασκαλόν* is explained to other prepositions with the non-ablatival genitive is very natural (A. J. P. XVIII 120), and while I have never committed myself to the doctrine, I have not failed to present that point of view to my students for many years. To reduce these floating theories into crystallized formulae takes all the life out of teaching, and I recognize that in the first line I am a teacher, and to be a teacher I must be to some extent an explorer. 'This sensible warm motion to become a kneaded clod,' that is to die before you are dead. Hence my reluctance to publish any system of Greek syntax, and in what I have thus far published the collection of examples figures far more than the theory, as it is worth more.

---

The *Meno* of Plato is an attractive dialogue even to the unmetaphysical soul, even to the least of the *ναρθηκοφόροι*. It has the true Platonic charm that appeals to the *ἄλογος αἴσθησις*, on which the schoolmasterly Dionysios always falls back, when he has nothing more to say. The athetizers have not been very successful in their assaults on it. In certain moods one wishes the athetizers well, and there have been days when on purely selfish grounds I should have rejoiced in the alienation of the Philebus, the very dialogue that the same inevitable Dionysios has seen fit to pick out as an admirable specimen of Plato's Socratic style (Dem. 1025 R.). But the *Meno*, though hardly a general favorite, has much to recommend it even to the novice in Plato. Apart from the geometrical puzzles, it ought not to present any very serious difficulty to the young student. It is one of the feline dialogues, if I may be pardoned for using the expression, in which Plato plays with his game and finally dismisses it with a scratch, which will enable one to recognize it when it comes up again. Just where to place it in the canon is a question that can be made interesting, both in regard to form and in regard to substance or, to use the phrases of the latest editor, both *stylo-metrically* and *'hylometrically'*. Then it is a great point gained to have characters in which the young student has invested a certain amount of Greek. This is one of the delights of taking an excursion party through the private speeches of the Attic orators and showing them the big-wigs in undress. So here *Meno* steps out of the picture-frame of the *Anabasis*, and Anytus, already known from the *Apology*, becomes a more vivid personality, and his final growl is a muttering of doom that appeals to a young scholar. Now this islet, as it may be called in comparison with the *Gorgias*, among the Fortunate Islands of the Platonic world, Mr. E. SEYMER THOMPSON (Macmillan & Co.) has seen fit to use as a dumping-ground for the Platonic lore which he has gathered from time to time during twelve years of study. When Karl Friedrich Hermann, whose *Geschichte und*

*System der platonischen Philosophie* Mr. THOMPSON has quoted in a Latin version, lectured on Lucian, he used to call his own edition of the *De historia conscribenda*, 'ein Muster von einem überladenen Kommentar,' and perhaps in after days Mr. THOMPSON will say the same thing of his sixty-four pages of introduction and two hundred and fifty of commentary, appendices and excursuses to fifty-six pages of text, the text being in large type. No irrelevance is surprising in such a book, and the greatest shock I have experienced in reading it was the recognition of a limit, as when the editor says on page 76 C: This is not the place for a full discussion of the erotic philosophy of Plato. But the worst of it is that Mr. THOMPSON is already fully aware of the tumultuous character of his work or, to put it in his own words, fears 'it is something of a farrago.' Yet with that lack of sympathy which is the most conspicuous characteristic of the Briton, instead of giving us as he might have done a model edition, he presents us with the unsorted accumulation of twelve years and says practically: 'Take it or leave it.' If the beginner is wise, he will leave it; but the unfortunate student of Plato has no choice and must rake over the pile in quest of articles of value. The grammatical side is perfectly exasperating. What does any one want with extracts from Riddell and Goodwin and Kühner, text-books that every student of Plato has at his elbow? And while the long lists of examples may have a certain value, the prolix discussions of grammatical points fail, in every instance I have examined, to help the student to clearer vision. To cite but one instance of Mr. THOMPSON'S lack of grammatical insight, in 84 A: ἐννοεῖς οὐ ἐστὶν ἤδη βαδίζων τοῦ ἀναμνησκεισθαι, he treats ἐστὶν βαδίζων as a periphrastic tense just as if he had never read Ar. Ran. 36: καὶ γὰρ ἐγγὺς τῆς θύρας | ἤδη βαδίζων εἰμί, when Kock has the right explanation.

---

It is spring. In the bookshop of the Sosii a voice is heard of one reading aloud a poem to the scrivener. It is a new poem by Vergil—the Georgics, to wit. The head of the house is putting the last touches to a MS. A stranger, attracted by the sound, looks into the shop, scans the titles of the books for sale, is especially struck by one, Quinti Flacci Horatii Sermones. This book he takes from its case and asks an old man whom he finds sitting in the shop what is the price of it. The person addressed was not the shopman, but the poet Furius Bibaculus, the stout gentleman who 'bespat the wintry Alps with hoary snow' (Sat. II 5, 41), no friend of Horace, as may be imagined, and the question is referred to an aged man, Orbilius of the Tawse. He too has not a good word to waste on Horace. 'Lucilius is the only master of the satire,' and Horace's 'protest and programme' (A. J. P. XXI 121) finds no favor in his eyes. But a newcomer interrupts him, Valerius Cato, who, like Horace, considers Lucilius 'durior componere versus,' as he has found out by his editorship

of the 'magnus Aurunca alumnus.' Thereupon ensues a pretty quarrel, and the two old men depart grumbling, each taking his own way, and both followed by the jeers of Furius, a famous wit in his day. While the buyer is left to bargain with Lucius Sosius himself, Horace enters, and the stranger, who is none other than Pompeius Varus of Carm. II 7, and the poet fall into each other's arms and there is much talk of the old war-times, with their hardships and horrors and hasty pleasures. To fit their converse, the voice of the reader is heard from within:

paribus concurrere pilis  
Romanas acies iterum videre Philippi.

But the verses that recall so much to the two old soldiers are soon followed by these others:

scilicet et tempus veniet, cum finibus illis  
agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro  
exesa inveniet scabra robigine pila,  
aut gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanes,  
grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris

and the scene closes with a prayer for peace by the poet of the abandoned targe.

---

I have given above a rough outline of the poem *Sosii Fratres Bibliopolae, carmen Iohannis Pascoli ex Castro Sancti Mauri* (Amsterdam, Muller), which has recently taken the Hoeufft prize for Latin verse-composition. The conception is not bad, and by giving it a place in *Brief Mention* I gain an opportunity to call attention to the fact that the art of Latin versification still buds and brings forth boughs like a plant, through the scent of the waters of Pactolus.

---

M. W.: Under the title *De emendando Differentiarum Libro* (Paris, Thorin), M. ALCIDES MACÉ has published a treatise of 170 pages, which constitutes the Prolegomena to a new edition of the *De Proprietate Sermonum* attributed to Isidore of Seville, which the author is preparing and for which there is certainly need, as the editions since 1602 have not essentially improved the text. For emending the work Macé has found material in Varro, Festus, Gellius, Nonius, Servius, Isidorus, and the Grammarians of the Corpus. He points out much confusion on the part of earlier editors. In the earliest editions the work was wrongly assigned to Cicero. The author has collated nine MSS (the earliest being of the ninth century), which he divides into three classes. In fifteen columns, occupying twenty-five pages, he compares the lemmata in his own edition with those found in other collections and grammarians. With the bibliography of his subject he shows an intimate acquaintance, and in an era so devoted to lexical investigation as the present, the new edition will be very welcome to scholars.

M. W.: The first edition of the second part of SCHANZ's *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* in the Müller Handbook Series appeared in 1892 (Munich, Beck). This new edition appears before the work itself is finished, but the fourth and concluding part is announced to appear shortly. The revision shows a great increase in volume, devoting 408 pages to the period which in the first edition occupied pp. 236-476. A useful Alphabetisches Register for this part alone is added at the end. The general lines of the treatment are the same, but there is much more abundance of detail and greater fulness in the citation of literature. Thus, double the space is allotted to the attitude of the various emperors from Tiberius to Trajan toward literature, and a similar proportion prevails throughout the work. The treatment of Germanicus and the Aratea, which was very meagre in the first edition, is here much more satisfactory; so too of Manilius, in whom as a writer a new interest has been shown in the last decade. The same is true of Statius, due in part to Vollmer's excellent edition of the *Silvae*. The discussion of Juvenal's life and works shows a marked advance. In the first edition no scepticism was shown as to the famous Juvenal inscription; now it is definitely referred to another Juvenal. The new fragment of Juvenal is not accepted as genuine, but the literature upon the subject is fully given, and its importance for the history of the text-tradition is recognized. The treatment of the more important authors, as Tacitus, Martial and Pliny, is very broad and suggestive, but the minor authors receive the same conscientious consideration; and our thanks are due to the author, whose unflagging industry has made this new edition so fully abreast of the times.

---

K. F. S.: Complete and trustworthy books of reference like FABIA'S *Onomasticon Taciteum* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1900) involve a tedium in the making which fully entitles their energetic authors to the reward of knowing that, whatever the "nutations" of Classical Philology, their work, once for all, has a real and permanent value to every student. A few moments spent in collating the Index Historicus, for example, of Halm, which has been reprinted again and again in the Teubner text, will dissipate any doubts as to the necessity of Fabia's compilation. In the single case of Achaia I observe that nearly a dozen references have been added. The list of over a hundred entries under the head of Corrigenda becomes far less formidable when examined, and does not affect our feelings of gratitude for a work which, taken with Greef's Lexicon, will, for the first time, put the entire text of Tacitus at our command.

## NECROLOGY.

EMIL HÜBNER,

*July 7, 1834—February 21, 1901.*<sup>1</sup>

The recent death of EMIL HÜBNER, Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Berlin, has brought personal sorrow to many American scholars, to none more poignant grief than to the writer of this tribute to a friendship which had lasted unbroken and unclouded for nearly fifty years. No scholar ever had more friends, none deserved them better. In Italy, where he studied in his young manhood, in Spain and Portugal, where he sojourned for a long time while making his epigraphical collections, in England, which he visited for the like purpose, he was as well known as he was in Germany; and though he declined a pressing invitation to the Chicago Exposition in 1893, there are Americans enough who have shared his generous hospitality at his charming house in Berlin to join those who are mourning the loss of a man whose winning personality and ready sympathy, moral and intellectual, gave a human interest to his encyclopaedic learning. Born on the seventh of July, 1834, the son of an eminent painter of the Düsseldorf school, Julius Hübner, and the nephew of another great artist, Eduard Bendemann, he belonged to a family of rare culture in art and letters; and his receptive nature blossomed into early maturity. He was only twenty years old when he received his Doctor's degree at the University of Bonn, where Ritschl determined his course of life, and thenceforth his career was one of rapid advancement. His chief line of work was Latin epigraphy, in which he rose to eminence as a collaborator in the Berlin Corpus, as a master of all the varieties of inscriptional forms. Most of his published works are in this line, but he was also a special student of Greek and Latin grammar, as is evinced by his extremely valuable bibliographical manuals on these subjects; and his wide range of interest is shown not only by his 'Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Geschichte und Encyclopädie der klassischen Philologie,' but by numerous contributions to German periodicals such as the *Deutsche Rundschau* and the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*. He was at home in many languages and had a keen appreciation of the recent productions of the English and American press. It is not every one who can turn from writing a searching review of a work on the Keltic element

<sup>1</sup> Reproduced from the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 151.

in Latin to inditing a sympathetic notice of Ian Maclaren's 'Country Doctor.' What he was to me personally, as the comrade of my youth, as the link that bound me to the period of revelation and aspiration, as the constant, generous friend of riper years, I will not trust myself to say. 'Ueber alles Glück geht doch der Freund, Der's fühlend erst erschafft, der's theilend mehrt.' But I can not close this imperfect notice without some reference to the work which Hübner did for the Johns Hopkins University. It will be remembered that in 1888-9 the Latin Department, owing to the protracted illness of Professor Warren, was without a head, and at my instance the authorities had recourse to Professor Hübner, who prepared a valuable bibliography of Cicero's Letters, with hints for study (J. H. U. Circulars, No. 72), which served to bridge over the chasm; and the reports on the dissertations submitted to his judgment were remarkable for their fulness, their conscientiousness, their discrimination.

Hübner died suddenly, as his younger brother, the successor of Wöhler at Göttingen, had died, called away from the fulness of an active and vigorous life. He was spared the pitifulness of slow senescence. He was alert to the end, such an end as he would doubtless have wished for himself. True, he had a great work on the stocks, a work which was to crown his life, but work unfinished is also a bequest.

When his highly gifted wife died, he had carved on her tomb a line from her father's translation of Aeschylus, 'Du bist vollbracht, Nachtwache meines Lebens.' It is a good epitaph for a scholar that watches on the outposts of scientific life. It is far better than the sigh which one hears from Heyne's Vergilian inscription, 'Vixi et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi.' But even Droysen could not rival the terseness of the Greek original. There are but two words, Διατεφρούρηται βίος.

---

A valued correspondent, M. JOSEPH KEELHOFF, Professor at the Athénée Royal of Antwerp, who had furnished for years the summaries of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY to the *Revue des Revues* and who had shown a lively and intelligent interest in all American philological work, as was evinced by his translation of Professor HALE'S *Art of Reading Latin*, has recently succumbed to a long and painful malady. Born April 20, 1860, M. KEELHOFF, who died February 28, 1901, had not yet completed his forty-first year. His latest letters show that he was working bravely to the end.

B. L. G.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Bennett (C. E.) and Bristol (G. P.) Teaching of Latin and Greek in the Secondary School. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 16 + 336 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.50.

Cicero, Letters of; in chronological order; tr. into English by E. S. Shuckburgh. In 4 v. V. 4, B. C. 44-43. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 46 + 386 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$1.50.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Three Literary Letters (ep. ad Ammaeum I; ep. ad Pompeium; ep. ad Ammaeum II); the Greek text ed., with English tr., by W. Rhys Roberts. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 11 + 232 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$2.50.

Ecclesiasticus. The Fragments hitherto recovered of the Hebrew Text in Facsimile. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. Net \$7.

Giles (P.) Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students. 2d ed., rev. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 11 + 619 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$3.25.

Gomperz (Theodor). Greek Thinkers: A History of Ancient Philosophy. Authorized ed. In 3 v. V. 1, tr. by Laurie Magnus. New York, *Scribner*, 1901. 15 + 610 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$4.

Nepos (Cornelius). Lives of Miltiades and Epaminondas; ed. by G. H. Nall. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 24 + 89 pp. 32mo, cl., net 40 cts.

Seneca (Lucius Annaeus). The Medea of Seneca; with introd. and notes by H. M. Kingery. Rev. ed. Crawfordsville, Ind., *The Author*, 1900. c. 71 pp. 8vo, pap., 25 cts.

Sophocles. Plays and Fragments. By Sir R. C. Jebb. Pt. 3. The Antigone. 3d ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 85 + 288 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$3.25.

### ENGLISH.

Acvaghosha. Discourse of Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana. Translated by T. Suzuki. London, 1900. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

Grenfell (B. P.) and others. Egypt Exploration Fund. Graeco-Roman Branch: Fayûm Towns and Their Papyri. London, 1900. 8vo. £1 5s.

Lambros (S. P.) Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos. Vol. II. London, 1900. 8vo. 21s.

Newberry (P. E.) and Crum (W. E.) Amherst Papyri (Egyptian) at Diddington Hall, Norfolk. London, 1900. 4to, 61 pp. With 24 Plates. £2 2s.

Rhys (J.) Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx. 2 vols. London, 1900. 8vo, 768 pp. 21s.

Tregear (E.) Dictionary of Mangarcoa (or Gambier Islands). London, 1900. 8vo. 6d.

## FRENCH.

Daremberg (Ch.) et Saglio (E.) Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines. Fasc. 29. Paris, 1900. 4to. 5 fr.

Godefroy (F.) Lexique de l'ancien français. Paris, 1900. 8vo. 20 fr.

Riemann (O.) et Goelzer (H.) Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin. Phonétique et étude des formes grecques et latines. Paris, 1900. 8vo, 600 pp. 20 fr.

## GERMAN.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, begründet v. Chrn. W. M. Grein. Fortgesetzt v. Rich. Paul Wülker. 5. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *G. H. Wigand*.—5. Waerferth v. Worcester (Bisch.) Uebersetzung der Dialoge Gregors des Grossen. Hrsg. v. Hans Hecht. xiii, 374 S. m. 20.

— assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XII 3. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XII 3. Zimmern (Heinr.) Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion. 3. (Schluss-)Lfg. 2. Hälfte. xii u. S. 129-226 m. 40 autogr. Taf. 1900. m. 30.

— — XVI. Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrische Lesestücke. 4. Aufl. xii, 193 S. Kart., m. 18.

Bienkowski (Pet.) De simulacris barbararum gentium apud Romanos. (In deutscher u. poln. Sprache.) gr. 4. 101 S. m. Abbildgn. Cracoviae, 1900. Wien, *Gerold & Co. in Komm.* m. 10.

Birt (Thdr.) Der Hiatt bei Plautus u. die lateinische Aspiration bis zum X. Jhd. nach Chr. gr. 8. iv, 375 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 9.60.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum a Gust. Loewe inchoatum, composuit, recensuit, ed. Geo. Goetz. Vol. VII. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.—VII. Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum confecit Geo. Goetz. Pars II. Accedit index graecus Guil. Heraei. 438 S. 1901. m. 24.

Demetrii Cydonii de contemnenda morte oratio, ex codicibus ed. Henr. Deckelmann. 8. xii, 47 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.

Dittenberger (Guilelm.) Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum. Iterum ed. D. Vol. III. gr. 8. 462 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel*. m. 14.

Euripidis fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. III, pars 4. Phoenissae, ed. N. Wecklein. gr. 8. 107 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Favonii Eulogii disputatio de somnio Scipionis. Ed. Alfr. Holder. 8. x, 48 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.40.

Gismondi (Henr.) Linguae syriacae grammatica et chrestomathia. Ed. II. gr. 8. 83, 169 u. 67 S. Roma, *Via del seminario* 120. m. 6.

Guidi (I.) Tables alphabétiques du Kitâb "al Agânî." Fasc. II. Lex. 8. xi u. S. 361-769. Leiden, 1900, *E. J. Brill*. m. 18.

Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. II. Fasc. I. Herons v. Alexandria Mechanik u. Katoptrik. Hrsg. u. übers. v. L. Nix u. W. Schmidt. Mit 101 Fig. 8. xlv, 415 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.

Ibn Kutaiba's Adab-al-kâtib. Hrsg. v. Max Grünert. gr. 8. x, 704 S. Leiden, 1900, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 20.

- Karst (Jos.) Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen. gr. 8. xxiii, 444 S. m. 2 Tab. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 15.
- Körting (Gust.) Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch. 2. Ausg. Lex. 8. vii S. u. 1252 Sp. Paderborn, 1901, *F. Schöningh*. m. 22.
- Lysiae orationes. Recensuit Thdr. Thalheim. Ed. maior. 8. 1, 400 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.
- Panzer (Frdr.) Hilde-Gudrun. gr. 8. xv, 451 S. Halle, 1901, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 12.
- Praetorius (Frz.) Ueber die Herkunft der hebräischen Accente. gr. 8. v, 54 S. Berlin, 1901, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 4.
- Procli Diadochi in Platonis rem publicam commentarii. Ed. Guil. Kroll. Vol. II. 8. ix, 476 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 8.
- Quellenwerke der altindischen Lexicographie. IV. (Schluss-)Bd. gr. 8. Wien, *A. Holder*.—IV. Hemachandra: Dhātupāṭha. Mit dem selbstverfassten Commentare des Autors. Hrsg. v. Joh. Kirste. 10, 288, 122 u. 34 S. 1899. m. 16.
- Reitzenstein (R.) M. Terentius Varro u. Johannes Mauropus v. Euchaita. gr. 8. v, 97 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.60.
- Schreiner (Jos.) Homers Odysee. Elementar-Skizzen der drei wichtigsten Oertlichkeiten Ὀδυσσεύς, Σχερίη, Ἰθάκη. gr. 8. iii, 103 S. Braunschweig, 1901, *R. Sattler*. m. 2.
- 'Umar Ibn Abi Rebi'a. Der Diwan. Hrsg. v. Paul Schwarz. 1. Hälfte. 4. viii, 67 u. 130 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 16.
- Valaori (J.) Der delphische Dialekt. gr. 8. x, 83 S. Göttingen, 1901, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 2.60.

## ITALIAN.

- Aristotele. La Costituzione di Atene, a cura di Cosattini. Testo e commento con figure e un facsimile. L. 3.
- Platone. La Repubblica. Libro I, a cura di V. Brugnola. Testo e commento, figurato. Firenze. L. 2.
- Plinio. Lettere scelte. Commento a cura di Longhi e Piovano. Firenze. Con figure e una tavola. L. 3.25.
- Zaccaria (Enrico). L'elemento germanico nella lingua italiana. Bologna. 16mo, pagine 560. L. 6.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

American Ethnology, Bureau of. Seventeenth Annual Report, 1895-6, by J. W. Powell. Part 2. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1898.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. The Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America. Vol. IV. No. 4. 1900.

— Supplement to vol. IV, 1900. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

Ancient East (The). No. 1. The Realms of the Egyptian Dead. London, *David Nutt*, 1901. 1s.

Aristote. Traité de l'âme. Traduit et annoté par G. Rodier. Tome I: Texte et traduction. Tome II: Notes (XVI 259, 582). Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1900.

Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum. By Robert Francis Harper. Part V. *The University of Chicago Press*. London, *Luzac & Co.*, 1900. 25s.

'Αθηνᾶ. Τόμος IB'. Τεύχος Δ'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1900.

— Τόμος II'. Τεύχος Α'. 'Αθήνησιν, 1901.

Blaisdell (E. A. and M. F.) The Child Life Primer. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901.

Brugmann (Karl). Griechisch ἄνθρωπος. (Separat-Abdruck.)

— Ueber das Wesen der sog. Wortzusammensetzung. Eine sprach-psychologische Studie. (Abdruck aus den 'Berichten der Königl.-Sächs. G. der Wissenschaften,' 14. Nov. 1900.)

Büttner-Wobst (Theodor). Beiträge zu Polybios. (Beig. 3. Jahresb. d. Gymn. zum heiligen Kreuz, Dresden.) 1901.

Chaucer. The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. The Knightes Tale. The Nonnes Prestes Tale. Ed., a critical text, with grammatical introduction, notes and glossary, by Mark H. Liddell. New York, *The Macmillan Co.* Baltimore, *Cushing & Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.

Ciaceri. La Alessandra di Licofrone. Teste, traduzione e commento. Catania, *Niccolò Giannotto*, 1901. L. 8.

Collitz (Hermann). The Home of the Heliand. (Reprint from 'Publications of the Modern Language Association,' vol. XIV, no. 1.)

Demosthenes on the Crown. With critical and explanatory notes, an historical sketch, and essays. By W. W. Goodwin. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1901.

Dodgson (E. S.) The Verb in the Second Book in Gipuskora Bask. Hertford (England), *Stephen Austin & Sons*, 1901. 2s.

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by J. A. H. Murray. GREEN-GIZZARN (vol. IV). INVALID-JEW (vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1891. Double sections @ 5s. \$1.25.

Forman (L. L.) Selections from Plato. With introduction and notes. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1900.

Foucart (P.) Les grands mystères d'Éleusis Personnel. Cérémonies. (Extrait des 'Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres,' Tome XXXVII.) Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, 1890. 6 fr. 50 c.

Gaertringen (Hiller v.) Ausgrabungen in Griechenland. Vortrag. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1901.

Gray (Louis H.) Contributions to Avestan Syntax, the Preterite Tenses of the Indicative. (Reprint from 'J. A. Or. S.' XXI.) 1900.

Griswold (H. De W. G.) Brahman. A Study in the History of Indian Philosophy. (Cornell Studies in Philosophy, no. 2.) New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1900.

Harre-Giercke. Lateinisches Übungsbuch. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1901. 2 m. 40 pf.

Huddilston (J. H.) Die griechische Tragödie im Lichte der Vasenmalerei. Neue durchgesehene Ausg. übersetzt von Marie Hense. Freiburg i./B., *Fehsenfeld*, 1900.

Hunter (Thomas). History of Philosophy. (Science Primer.) New York, *American Book Co.*, 1901.

Hyde (Mary F.) Two-Book Course in English. Book I: Lessons in the Use of English. Introd. price, 35 cts.—Book II: Practical English Grammar. Introd. price, 50 cts. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1901.

Jackson (A. V. Williams). The Religion of the Achaemenian Kings. First Series. The Religion according to the Inscriptions. With an Appendix by Dr. Louis H. Gray. (Reprint from 'J. Am. Or. Soc.' XXI.) 1900.

Juvenal. Edited with introduction, notes on thirteen satires, and indices by Henry Parks Wright. Boston, *Ginn & Co.* New York, 1901.

— The New Fragments of. A lecture delivered at Corpus Christi College on Tuesday, February 5, 1901. By Robinson Ellis. London, *Henry Frowde*. 1s.

Lebreton (Julius). Caesariana syntaxis quatenus a Ciceroniana differat. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*, 1901.

— Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.* 10 fr.

Little (Charles Edgar). A Grammatical Index to the Chāndogya-upaniṣad. (Vanderbilt Oriental Series.) New York, *American Book Co.*, 1901.

Modern Language Association, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. Vol. XVI, No. 1. N. S., Vol. IX, No. 1. I. Fuller (H. De W.) The Sources of Titus Andronicus.—II. Baker (G. P.) 'Titus and Vespacia' and 'Titus and Andronicus.'—IV. Faust (A. B.) The Problematic Hero in German Fiction.—V. Carruther (W. H.) Lessing's Treatment of the Story of the Ring and the Teaching.—VI. Hatfield (J. T.) A Note on the Prison-Scene in Goethe's Faust.—VII. Collitz (H.) The Home of the Heliand. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1901.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 20: Seifen-Stimmen. Lfg. 21: Stimmen-tröpfeln. New York, *The International News Co.*, 1901. @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Johannes Ilberg u. Richard Richter. III. Jahrg. 1900. V. u. VI. Bandes, 10. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1900.

Persius, The Satires of. Translated with an introduction and some notes by Samuel Hemphill, D. D., LL. D. Dublin, *Hodges, Figgis & Co.* London, *George Bell & Sons*, 1901.

Popular Studies in Mythology, Romance and Folklore. No. 10. The Romance Cycle of Charlemagne and His Peers, by Jessie L. Weston. London, *David Nutt*, 1901. 6d.

Porto Rico, Census of, Report on the. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1900.

Powell (J. W.) Philology as the Science of Activities designed for Expression. (*American Anthropologist*, N. S., vol. II, Oct.-Dec. 1900.) New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1900.

Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἐτους 1899. Ἀθήνησιν, 1900.

Puchstein (Otto). Die griechische Bühne. E. architektonische Untersuchung. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1901. 8 m.

Rheinisches Museum. Herausg. v. Franz Buecheler u. Hermann Usener. N. F. LVI 1. Frankfurt, *Sauerländer*, 1901.

Rizzo (Gaetano). Le tavole finanziarie di Taormina. Parte III. Messina, 1901.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

Caesaris commentarii de bello civili, etc. Recens. Renatus du Pontet. 75 cts.

Ciceronis orationes pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae I-XIV. Recogn. A. C. Clark. 75 cts.

Q. Horati Flacci opera. Recogn. E. C. Wickham. 75 cts.

Thucydidis Historiae. Libri V-VII. Recogn. H. Stuart Jones. 90 cts. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1901.

Sophocles, The Oedipus Tyrannus of. Ed. by Mortimer Lamson Earle. New York, *American Book Co.* (1901).

Thucydides. Histories. Book III. Edited with notes for the use of schools. By Herbert F. Fox. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1901.

Tolman (H. C.) The Art of Translating. With special reference to Cauer's Die Kunst des Uebersetzens. Boston, *Benj. H. Sanborn*, 1901. 70 cts.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (U. v.) Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyrik. (Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-histor. Klasse. N. F. Bd. IV, No. 3.) Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1900. 8 m.